Mr. SPEAKER.—May we now take up the Andhra State Bill ?

Sri MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldrug).—Before we go to discuss the further provisions of this Bill, I would like to make this submission to the Chair. Yesterday I had raised a point of privilege regarding the use of internal telephone. I would like the Chair to give its ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is it causing disturbance now ? Of course I promised to give my ruling to-day, but due to some other business I could not find time ; I will do so tomorrow, if not this afternoon.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN (Kolar).—In the meanwhile is there no stay order ? (Laughter).

Mr. SPEAKER.—That application will be duly considered. (*Laughter*).

ANDHRA STATE BILL, 1953.

Clauses.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Anjaneya Reddy may now speak on his amendment.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಸಿ. ಆಂಜನೇಯರೆಡ್ಡಿ (ಚಿಂತಾಮಣಿ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ನನ್ನ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಈ ರೀತಿಯಿದೆ :

'ಆಂಧ್ರ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಪಕ್ಕದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮತ್ತು ಮೈಸೂರು ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ತೆಲುಗು ಮಾತನಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಜನರಿರುವ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳನ್ನು ಆಂಧ್ರ ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿಸಲು ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ 3ನೆಯ ಕ್ಲಾಜನ್ನು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು.'

ಈ ನನ್ನ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೈಸೂರು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ತೆಲುಗು ಮಾತನಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಜನರಿರುವ ಪ್ರದೇಶವನ್ನು ಆಂಧ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿಸುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವಾಗ ಕನ್ನಡ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಒಂದು ಭಾಷೆಯ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ದೇಶವನ್ನು ವಿಸ್ತರಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಆಗ್ಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ತೆಲುಗು ಮಾತಾಡುವ ಜನರಿರುವ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳನ್ನೂ ಗಣನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಆಂಧ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನಾನು ನನ್ನ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

> "That clause 3 be so amended as to provide for the incorporation in the State of Andhra of the Telugu speaking areas of the State of Mysore that are contiguous to the State of Andhra."

*Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Chief Minister).—I have listened with great attention to the point of view put forward by my Hon'ble friend Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy and Sri B. V. Narayana Reddy and also Sri Anjaneya Reddy. Sir, I am thankful to Hon'ble Members Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy and Sri B. V. Narayana Reddy for stating their case so frankly and I admit, so sincerely. When we are envisaging the integration of neighbouring areas into Mysore State, I find that these two Hon'ble Members have integrated themselves completely with Communism. It is that that makes them put forward the view they have done. (Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy.—Question). If I have understood them correctly—I have every reason to say I have understood them correctly, because though there may be a slight political difference between them and me, as I have already said, I concede their frankness and sincerity of purpose,—I find that they have been carried away by the ideology and programme of Communism and Communist Party rather than by the dictates of the events that are passing before us. Communists throughout India have taken the stand that linguistic provinces have to be formed. They use the words, as Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy has used, that each group of people who speak a particular language is of a different nationality, of course in the sense in which Soviet Russia is using them. Therefore, their view is not so much territorial or even linguistic as one of Communist Party's programme and ideology. They will not misunderstand me if I say that the Communist Party has very few followers in Mysore State. Communist ideology has not made any headway in Mysore State. Therefore they are in infinitesimal minority. I therefore plead with them to see that people of Mysore do not approve of the ideas sponsored by them as they have done on the floor of this House. It may

be that the womb of future may do things differently. I am not a prophet; but, as things stand to-day, I am certain this communist ideology will not be accepted by the country. In fact, the Madras Government have taken that stand and if I also take that stand, it would be quite reasonable. It is the communist elements in Andhra who are working this problem into this high pitch. I do not impute any motives to them because after all they are sincere in what they are doing and they are working on those lines; but they are judging this issue solely from the point of view of what they ultimately want to establish, *viz.*, a proletarian dictatorship. We are a democracy and we are a representative democracy. We are very very far away from the ideal of proletarian dictatorship that they want to establish through linguistic provinces and other programmes. I therefore find it difficult, nay impossible, to accept any of the amendments, and I am sure the House is in agreement with me. Without any further debate on these amendments, I would request the House to reject these amendments.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What does the Mover say now, as regards his first amendment ?

Sri MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldrug).—Sir, I may be allowed to make one clarification, though it is out of the way, because the Chief Minister made certain statements.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You can make use of some other occasion for that.

Sri MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.—Because I am advocating the cause of these linguistic provinces, I should never be understood to have made any of these statements on behalf of the Communist Party. I do not belong to that party and I repudiate the allegations that are made against me.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—That is why I qualified by saying 'as I understand it.'

Mr. SPEAKER.—What does the Hon'ble Member say regarding the first amendment ?

Sri MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.—I press the amendment, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That clause 3 be so amended as to provide for the Government of India taking necessary steps to finally settle the boundaries of the Madras, Andhra and Mysore, Orissa, Hyderabad and Madhya Pradesh States, either by mutual agreement among the States concerned or by the appointment of a Boundary Commission or Commissions that the districts concerned may thereupon be reformed or reorganised accordingly."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—As regards the second amendment ?

Sri MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.—I press that amendment also, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That clause 3 be so amended as to provide for the setting up of Boundary Commission on or within one month after the appointed day to re-demarcate the boundary between the States of Mysore and Andhra, especially the disputed areas in Kudligi, Hospet, Siriguppa, Sandur taluks of Bellary district."

The motion was negatived.

Sri MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.—I press my third amendment also.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That sub-clause (1) be so amended as to include the following areas in the Andhra State to be formed from the appointed day, namely :—

'Moka, Rupanagudi, Bellary firkas inncluding Bellary town in Bellary taluk in Bellary district, Gudiyatham taluk in North Arcot district, and Hosur taluk and Krishnagiri taluk in Salem district, in Madras State; Hyderabad, Mahaboobnagar, Adilabad, Nizamabad, Madak, Karimnagar, Warrangal, Nalagonda

(MR. SPEAKER.)

districts and Tanalur taluk in Osmanabad district and Gadunal and Alumpur taluks in Raichur district in Hyderabad State; Bastar, Chenda districts in Madhya Pradesh State; Kuropet district and Berhampur Parliakimedi, Ganjam taluk in Ganjam district in Orissa State; Kolar district, Pavagada, Madhugiri, Koratagere taluks in Tumkur district, Molakalmuru, Challakere taluks and eastern parts of Chitaldrug, Jagalur, Hiriyur taluks in Chitaldrug district, Anekal, Devanahalli, Bangalore North, Bangalore South, Hoskote taluks and the City of Bangalore, in Bangalore district in Mysore State '-"

The motion was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The fourth amendment stands in the name of Sri Anjaneya Reddy. What does he propose to do?

Sri M. C. ANJANEYA REDDY.—I press it, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That clause 3 be so amended as to provide for the incorporation in the State of Andhra of the Telugu speaking areas of the State of Mysore that are contiguous to the State of Andhra."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Regarding Amendment No. 8, what does Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy say?

Sri MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.—I press it, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That clauses 3 and 4 be so amended as to provide for the appointment of a Boundary Commission at the earliest time to determine the boundary between the States of Mysore and Andhra and to decide the question of including the areas of Rupanagudi Moka and Bellary firkas including Bellary town of Bellary Taluk in either State, by means of a plebiscite."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The fifth amendment stands in the name of Sri Imam. He may move it.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—Sir, I beg to move:

"That clauses 3 and 4 be so amended as to provide for the transfer of the whole of Bellary district as also of South Canara District, Kollegal, Madakasira and Kalyanadurga Taluks, Nilgiri and Hosur to the State of Mysore."

Sir, this amendment comprises two issues. One is the inclusion of the entire district of Bellary in the State of Mysore and the second issue is the inclusion of all the residuary Kannada speaking areas in the State of Madras into Mysore. Sir, regarding the first issue, the inclusion of the entire district of Bellary into Mysore. I stated in the course of the general debate the reasons why it should be included in the State of Mysore. I am glad that the Chief Minister in the course of his reply admitted and agreed with me. He said that in the logical course, these three taluks must be handed over to the State of Mysore. Sir, I was thinking since yesterday what the definition of Andhra is and who are the Andhras. Are all people speaking Telugu Andhras? I have taken some pain to look into history. Yesterday my friends Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy and Sri B. V. Narayana Reddy stated that they were Andhras. I do not admit that claim. They are hundred per cent, by birth and culture, Mysoreans. (Applause) They can never be Andhras. We can never let them be Andhras unless they migrate from Mysore. I have got in my hands an Advanced History of India by R. C. Majumdar, H. C. Rayachaudhuri and Kalikinkar Datta. According to them, Andhra State

comprises the area between the Godavari and Krishna rivers. Andhra is the name applied to the people of Telugu-speaking tract at the mouth of Godavari and Krishna. They were also called Satavahanas. I will read the relevant portion:

> "The southern potentate who put an end to the rule of the Sungas and the Kanvas is described in the puranas as an Andhra, a name applied to the people of Telugu-speaking tract at the mouth of the Godavari and the Krishna. In contemporary epigraphic records, however, Kings of this line are invariably referred to as Satavahana and a district of the Satavahanas has been proved to lie in the neighbourhood of Bellary in the Kanarese area of the Madras Presidency."

So, there was a King called Satavahana and Andhra is the name of a king in the Puranas. He established a kingdom between the Godavari and Krishna. That area is known as Andhra.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—It is a delta area.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Yes, it is a delta area. This historical account has been written by three people. Sri R. C. Majumdar and others.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—You may also say that the writer is not a Kannadiga.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—(Minister for Home and Industries).—It is the latest book also.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Again Sir, in several places they hold that Andhras are only those Telugu-speaking people who live in the mouth of Krishna and between the basins of Krishna and Godavari. So, I cannot admit the claim of my friend....

Sri T. MARIAPPA (Mysore City North).—The Maharastras are there at the source.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—So, the Andhras are in Godavari valley. This predominantly apply to Godavari valley and only that area which comprises that veliey is called Andhra and all the people who speak in Telugu whether they are in Madras or Mysore can never be termed as Andhra. They can never go to Andhra, much less Sri B. V. Narayana Reddy and Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy. So, this is an argument that I have to put forward why the entire District of Bellary can never be classed as an Andhra Province or as belonging to the Andhras. The jurisdiction territorially is beyond the Andhra territory as is envisaged or as can be ascertained by the historical records. Secondly, as I pointed out, culturally it is beyond the jurisdiction or purview of Andhra State. It may be asked as to why there are so many Telugu-speaking people in Bellary District specially in the taluks of Adoni and Rayadurg. I have got a paragraph from Kelkar's Report wherein he has given the reason why Telugu became predominant there. When it was ceded to the British, the people of this District mostly spoke Kannada. When it became part of Madras, only Andhra officials were posted. This is what Mr. Kelkar says:

> "The officers appointed in the beginning in the Bellary District were Telugu. They brought their own language and culture with them and spread it in the District. The Telugu language became the office and court language and the work of bringing the district completely under Telugu influence was completed by the vernacular schools being ordained to be Telugu Schools."

That is how Telugu language became prominent and after the year 1916 there was one Collector called Maskaradi who toured the whole district and sent a report to Madras Government that the Madras Government have done an injustice to the District of Bellary because though there are Kannada-speaking people dominant in that area, they have imposed Telugu as the court language. It was then

(SRI J. MOHAMED IMAM.)

that the Government issued an order that both Kannada and Telugu languages may be introduced as the court languages. It is merely by accident and by the fact that there were predominantly Telugu Officers in that District that Telugu was imposed on the people and that is how the Kannada people learnt Telugu. I often speak in Telugu with Sri Narayana Reddy.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—I also speak Telugu.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I wish you had not admitted it. He will claim you for an Andhra. So far as these taluks are concerned, there are some people who speak Telugu. But this should not be the criterion because Telugu was imposed by other people who had the power and who did that injustice. We are to judge by the historical background, by the cultural background and by the custom of those people. I stated the other day how culturally the entire Bellary District was separated from the jurisdiction of Andhra University and supported by Andhra Leaders themselves and as such, taking all the things into consideration, there is every reason why Bellary District as a whole should go over to Mysore. As I have already stated, the Tungabhadra Dam is situated in the Kannada-speaking area, *i.e.*, Hospet and nearly 3 or 4 taluks which are not served by the dam are going to be affected from the health point of view and it is very important to look after them. Under these circumstances, the entire question has to be reconsidered and the entire district must become part of the Bellary District. I have got here a map of the Bellary District. The red area comprises of the Tungabhadra area of which nearly four taluks, though they are not benefited by Tungabhadra Project, have to suffer because of the spread of water of 133 sq. miles and nearly three taluks are affected and we have to take care of their health and take necessary precaution to maintain their health; it involves enormous expenditure. Taking all those things into consideration, it is better in the interest of administration and in the interest of smooth working of irrigation project, and it is quite necessary that the entire district must be retained as one unit. Otherwise, as I said, it would be disastrous.

Now with regard to these three taluks of Rayadurga, Adoni and Alur, I will first come to Rayadurg. Rayadurg, if handed over to Andhra, will become an enclave. It is very near, in fact it is only 7 miles from Molakalmuru. On one side there iis Molakalmuru Taluk and on the other sides there are Kudligi and Bellary Taluks and thus it becomes isolated and an enclave. Secondly, I may state that Rayadurg was formerly part of Kudligi Sub-Division and it was associated with Kannada-speaking Taluk; but it was only latterly on account of administrative convenience, this taluk was created as a separate taluk and it was added to some other sub-division. Very recently some of the villages of Bellary Taluk, including Hiralu Firka which was predominantly a Kannada-speaking area, were added on to Rayadurg Taluk. There is very close affinity and greater relationship between Mysore and Rayadurg than between Rayadurg and Anantapur or any other place. We know it from personal experience that people of Rayadurg always day and night visit the District of Chitaldrug and their business relationship lies with the District of Chitaldrug and I am sure that the people of this taluk are anxious to join Mysore and it is worthwhile to ascertain their will. In fact, there are many representations to the Centre that the people of this Taluk be added on to the State of Mysore rather than to the so called Andhra.

1-30 P.M.

Sri MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.—Why 'so called Andhra' Sir? Call it 'Andhra'.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—According to me, Andhra is only between Krishna and Godavari. Sir, regarding Alur, the very name Alur implies that it must be a Kannada taluk. We have got some places by that name in Mysore State. The very name shows that it is a Kannada-speaking area. Moreover, I understand that the people of this taluk are very anxious to go over to Mysore along with Bellary. Coming to Adoni, I may bring to the notice of the Leader of the House, the fact that these people, from the beginning, are agitating for the inclusion of Adoni with the State of Mysore. There were four conferences held and they have all expressed their desire that Adoni should be added on to the State of Mysore. Culturally and historically also it forms part of Mysore and part of Bellary and there is every reason that Adoni should come to Mysore. So, Sir, I submit, there is no justification for the separation of these three Taluks from the Bellary District. It would be something like cutting the limbs and handing over the body to one and throwing the limbs to the other. It would be in the interest of the country and in the interest of the State that all these three taluks are given over to Bellary District and the entire Bellary District is added on to State of Mysore.

Coming to the second issue, I wish to emphasise that this is the time for the Government of India to consider seriously the inclusion of the Kannada-speaking areas in the residuary State of Madras into the State of Mysore. Sir, I must, with due deference to the Central Government, respectfully submit to them and also suggest to them that it is always desirable in the interest of the country to take all these questions as a whole and once for all decide and this will help the lessening of trouble and controversy. The Central Government knows very well that the people residing in the residuary State of Madras, speaking Kannada, are very anxious to go over to the State of Mysore. Instead of deciding only the question of Bellary, if they had taken the question of all these areas and had made an announcement that all these areas would go to Mysore, it would have lessened all difficulties, troubles and controversies. But it seems to me that the policy of Government of India is to take up each area at a time, which means every time they will have the same trouble and controversy. I, therefore, submit in the interest of the country and in the interest of the Central Government itself, that they should treat all these matters as one question and take a decision once for all. I am anxious that before 1st October they must settle the fate of all these areas.

Then, Sir, with regard to South Canara, some time back I was there and the Chief Minister was there; the Chief Minister addressed one meeting and I also addressed one gathering. I ascertained the views of the people. Those people are very anxious to go over to Mysore. They are not at all anxious to remain in the residuary State of Madras. They pathetically ask us, 'what would be our fate? It may take years and years to settle all this. We request you to consider this question and settle this question.' So, Sir, we welcome them and Government of India must make a decision regarding South Canara. It is not only the views of these people to come over to Mysore but adding South Canara to the State of Mysore will be to the mutual benefit of both. Mysore will have the advantage of having a neighbour district which has been developed to a considerable extent. It has good resources, it has good educational and medical facilities. But, it is neglected in its own way. Though Mangalore is a big city with a population of 2,00,000, there is no water facility there. They are very much neglected because the place is 400 miles away from the capital town of Madras. Such a big city with 2,00,000 population has not got facility for drinking water and if we

(Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.)

go there, we have to drink the well water. This shows how much they have been neglected. Thanks to the good number of Missionaries who have done a lot of work there....

Sri D. DEVARAJA URS (Hunsur).—It is for them to say all these things. Why should we say all this with regard to a sister Government that they have neglected?

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Is it a point of order, Sir? I have not yielded. You were also there, Sri Devaraja Urs.

Sri D. DEVARAJA URS.—Yes. When the occasion arises I will let you know my experiences.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Anyhow, that is a matter regarding which the Government of India must take a decision. The people of South Canara have been agitating and this will create troubles and friction.

Coming to other parts like Madakasira and Hosur, I think, everyone of us must have the experience of Madakasira. It is an enclave surrounded by the State of Mysore and the people there are hundred per cent Kannada-speaking people. Some may speak Telugu also, but as all of us know, even the Chief Minister knows, for communication purposes this Madakasira Taluk comes right between Madhugiri and Pavagada. So, there is a very good case for adding Madakasira also to Mysore State.

Similarly, Sir, regarding Nilgiris Government of India will have to come to a decision. The people of Nilgiris have expressed their desire to join Mysore. Recently, I think, the Chief Minister presided over the Karnataka Conference there and they expressed their view to come over to Mysore, and so, the Government of India must take a decision in this matter also.

The people of Kollegal want to join with the State of Mysore. Sri A. Bheemappa Naik and Sri Anantaraman had been there and they know the minds of those people, how anxious they are to join Mysore. Lastly, Sir. Kalyanadurg is adjacent to Molakalmuru and Ananthapur. These areas also are bordering Challakere taluk. The majority of the people there are Kannadigas. I know the minds of these people because my mother comes from Kalyandurg Taluk. I am a hundred per cent Kannadiga. So, what I want to emphasise is, though Bellary District is the only district that is under consideration, it must be realised that there are other districts or similar districts which are in similar position, and the people of those places are very anxious that their future should be settled once for all. So, before 1st October, it is easy for the Government of India to make a declaration as to what their attitude is towards these Kannada-speaking areas.

But unfortunately till now they are silent. So they must take a decision. On this ground I commend this amendment for the acceptance of this House. And I am sure that every one of us will see the justice of the demand of the people of those areas which are going over to Mysore that they must be included in the Kannada-speaking areas. So I once again commend this amendment for the acceptance of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

> "That clauses 3 and 4 be so amended as to provide for the transfer of the whole of Bellary District as also of South Canara District, Kollegal, Madakasira and Kalyandurga Taluks, Nilgiri and Hosur to the State of Mysore."

I would like to suggest once again, course with some modification, that amendments Nos. 6, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15 and 16 are all of the same nature. The amendment of Sri Mohamed Imam covers all these amendments. In fact it is wider in scope than the others. As such I would like to know whether those Hon'ble Members who have proposed these other amendments will move their amendments.

They need not move. But if some of them are very anxious to move, they may take part in the debate on the present amendment itself, because it includes the subject-matter of their amendments. That is my suggestion. But it is left to them.

No. 6 stands in the name of Sri Rudrappa and Sri M. Linganna. They need not move this amendment. No. 9 stands in the name of Sri S. Gopala Gowda. In that he has omitted the question of Nilgiri but Sri Imam's amendment covers Nilgiris also. Therefore Sri Gopala Gowda may speak on the present amendment, because it is wider covering the inclusion of other districts. So also No. 10 by Sri Linganna need not be moved by him. The same thing in respect of No. 12 by Sri H. S. Rudrappa. Again No. 14 by Sri Linganna need not be moved.

Sri M. LINGANNA (Nanjangud).—Is that amendment in respect of clause 4? If so, I would like to move that.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You have added the words 'Mysore Bharat.' That is all.

Sri M. LINGANNA.—I want to make one point clear so far as this amendment is concerned. I have put in the words 'Mysore Bharat' definitely.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I can see the significance of it. However, it will mean the very same thing as the other amendments.

Sri M. LINGANNA.—I have advisedly put in the words and so I would like to move that amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Of course, I cannot prevent any Hon'ble Member from moving his amendment if he is really very anxious to do so in spite of my suggestion which I feel is quite right. No. 15 is also covered by Sri Imam's amendment.

Sri S. GOPALA GOWDA (Sagar-Hosanagar).—That is about the appointment of the Boundary Commission.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The first and the second amendments are discussed. As regards territories, the amendment of Sri Imam covers a wider ground. Therefore you can speak on that amendment. You can speak now. It is only expected that this amendment will not be moved separately.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri S. Gopala Gowda may speak now either in support of or against Sri Imam's amendment.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಮಹಮ್ಮದ್ ಇಮಾಂರವರು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡಿಸಿರುವ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಅನುಮೋದಿಸುತ್ತಾ ನಾನು ಒಂದೆರಡು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಾನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿರುವ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯು ಕೂಡ ಶ್ರೀ ಇಮಾಂರವರು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿರುವ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯ ಉದ್ದೇಶವನ್ನೇ ಹೊಂದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ನನ್ನ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ನಾನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿಡಲು ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗತಾನೇ ಶ್ರೀ ಇಮಾಂರವರು ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ ಪೂರ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಅಂದರೆ ಕನ್ನಡ ಪ್ರಾಂತಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕಾದುದು ನ್ಯಾಯ ಎಂಬ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪುಷ್ಟೀಕರಿಸಿ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಪುಷ್ಟೀಕರಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಜಸ್ಟಿಸ್ ಮಿಶ್ರಾರವರ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಒಂದು ವಾಕ್ಯವನ್ನು ಉದಹರಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ:

> "It would, however, be relevant to examine the linguistic history of the area. It would appear that about 1872, the whole of Bellary District and even some portion of Anantapur District were predominantly Kannada, *vide* the Manual of Bellary District published in 1872 which cites Col. Wilk's observations to the effect that a line drawn from Gooty to Anantapur and so on due South would mark the boundary between the two languages. Apparently there has been gradual Telugu infiltration from East to West and this movement was natural as the Kannada area in Madras State is very small and adjoins a large Telugu area. The Kannada area of Bellary, however, still retains its identity and I can see no reason why it should be allowed to be submerged by the sweeping on rush of the Telugu side."

ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಷಾವಾರು ಪ್ರಾಂತ ರಚನೆಗೆ ಕೊಡಬಹುದಾದ ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯತೆಯನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ಜಸ್ಟಿಸ್ ಮಿಶ್ರಾರವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆ ತಳಹದಿಯ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.)

ಮೇಲೆಯೇ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ ಆರು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳೂ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿವೆ ಎಂದು ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ ಒಡೆದು ಎರಡು ಭಾಗವಾಗಬಾರದು ಎಂಬ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಜಸ್ಟಿಸ್ ವಾಂಛೂರವರು ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಲವು ದಿನಗಳ ಮುಂಚೆಯವರೆಗೆ ಇತ್ತು ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಬಂದಿದೆ. ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ಇಡೀ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯೂ ಕನ್ನಡ ಪ್ರಾಂತಕ್ಕೇ ಸೇರಬೇಕಾದುದು ನ್ಯಾಯ. ಆದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಆದವಾನಿ, ಆಲೂರು, ರಾಯದುರ್ಗ—ಈ ಮೂರು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳು ಬಹುಶಃ ತೆಲುಗು ಬಾಂಧವರ ಒತ್ತಾಯದಿಂದಲೇ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಿಂದ ಕತ್ತರಿಸಿ ಆಂಧ್ರ ಪ್ರಾಂತಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಗಿದೆಯೋ ಏನೋ ಎಂದು ಅನುಮಾನ ಪಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಒಂದು ಅಥವಾ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಬೌಂಡರಿ ಕಮಿಷನ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ರಚನೆಮಾಡಿ ಪುನಃ ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪುನರ್ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ ಪೂರ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ಪ್ರಾಂತಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿಸುವುದರಿಂದ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಉಪಕಾರ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಆದೀತು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ನಂಬಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಆಂಧ್ರ ಪ್ರಾಂತದ ರಚನೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡುವ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮದರಾಸು ಪ್ರಾಂತದಲ್ಲಿ ಉಳಿದಿರುವ ಕನ್ನಡ ಭಾಷೆಯನ್ನು ಆಡುವ ದಕ್ಷಿಣಕನ್ನಡ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ, ನೀಲಗಿರಿ ಮತ್ತು ಕೊಳ್ಳೇಗಾಲ ಮತ್ತು ಅನಂತಪುರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದು ಈಗಿರುವ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಐಕ್ಯವಾದಂತೆ ಇರುವ, ಭಾಷೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅದರ (geographical position) ಭೌಗೋಳಿಕ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಕೂಡ, ಮಡಕಶಿರ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕೂ ಸಹ ಏನಾಗಬೇಕೆಂಬ ವಿಚಾರಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಏಳು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಪಕ್ಕದ ಕನ್ನಡ ಪ್ರಾಂತವಾದ ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕೆಂಬ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿದರೋ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಉಳಿದ ಕನ್ನಡ ಪ್ರಾಂತಗಳನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ಇದೇ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಕ ಮಾಡಿ ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿಸುವುದು ತೀರಾ ಅವಶ್ಯಕ ಮತ್ತು ಅಗತ್ಯ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮನಗಾಣಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

ಹೀಗೆ ಈ ಭಾಗಗಳನ್ನು ಈಗಿರುವಂತೆ ಕೈಬಿಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಯಾವ ಪ್ರಾಂತಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಹಾಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಬಗೆಹರಿಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮದರಾಸು ಮತ್ತು ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ಎಲ್ಲೆಕಟ್ಟಾಗಲಿ, ಮೈಸೂರು ಮತ್ತು ಆಂಧ್ರದ ಎಲ್ಲೆಕಟ್ಟಾಗಲಿ ಇದರಿಂದ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ನಾವು ವಿವೇಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದೇನೆಂದರೆ ನೂತನ ಆಂಧ್ರ ಪ್ರಾಂತದ ರಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಈಡೇರಿಸುವ ಉದ್ದೇಶವನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಡ್ರಾಫ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದವರು ಬಹುಶಃ ಬಹಳ ನೈಪುಣ್ಯತೆಯಿಂದ ಡ್ರಾಫ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂತಲೇ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಕಾರಣ ಅವರು ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಬಗೆಹರಿಸುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸಮರ್ಥರಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಅನುಮಾನವಿಲ್ಲದೇಯಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೈಬಿಟ್ಟಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಏನೋ ಒಂದು ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಇರಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಕೂಡ ಊಹಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ವಿದೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಪಕ್ಷಾತೀತವಾದ ಮತ್ತು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಅರ್ಧ ಶತಮಾನಗಳಿಂದೀಚೆಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲ ದೇಶಾಭಿಮಾನಿಗಳೂ, ತಜ್ಞರೂ ಮತ್ತು ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ದುಡಿದು ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದ ಅಭ್ಯುದಯಕ್ಕೆ ಶ್ರಮಿಸಲು ನಿಂತಿರತಕ್ಕವರೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಇಷ್ಟಾಗಿ ಬೆಳಕು ಚೆಲ್ಲದೆ ಅಥವಾ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಬಗೆಹರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಾರದೆ ಇರುವುದು ಬಹಳ ವಿಷಾದದ ಸಂಗತಿ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಲ ವಿಳಂಬವಾಗುವುದು ಮಾತ್ರವಲ್ಲ, ಹೆಚ್ಚು ವೈಮನಸ್ಯಕ್ಕೂ ಪರಸ್ಪರ ತಿಕ್ಕಾಟಕ್ಕೂ ಕಾರಣವಾಗುವುದಲ್ಲದೆ ದೇಶದ ಪ್ರಗತಿಯೂ ಬಹಳವಾಗಿ ಈ ನೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಕುಂಠಿತವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಡಬೇಕು. ಈವೊತ್ತು ನಾವು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಯಾರು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಸೇರಬಹುದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ನಾವು ಸುಸ್ವಾಗತ ನೀಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಆಗಾಗ್ಗೆ ಪ್ರಕಟಗೊಳಿಸುವುದು ಉಂಟು. ಅದೇ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಇನ್ನೂ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಇಂತಿಂತಹ ಪ್ರಾಂತಗಳೂ, ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳೂ ಈ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಕನ್ನಡ ಪ್ರಾಂತದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಮಾವೇಶಗೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎಂದು. ನಾವು ಆ ರೀತಿ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾದ ನಿಲುವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಬೇಕಾದುದ್ದು ಎಂದಿಗಿಂತ ಇವೊತ್ತು ಬಹಳ ಅಗತ್ಯ, ಅವಶ್ಯಕ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಅನೇಕ ಅನುಮಾನಗಳಿಗೆ, ಶಂಕೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಕಾರಣವುಂಟಾಗುವುದಲ್ಲದೆ ಉದ್ದೇಶಗಳನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ತಪ್ಪು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಗೆಳೆಯರು ಕೆಲವರು ಆಂಧ್ರರ ಪರ ಎಂದರೆ ತೆಲುಗು ಭಾಷೆಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾಧಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಆಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಜನರು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳನ್ನು ಆಂಧ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂಬ ವಾದವನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಡುತ್ತಾ ತೀವ್ರವಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಾದಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಂದಮಾತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ನಾವು ಹೌಹಾರಿ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ಅವರು ಎಂದರೆ ಆಂಧ್ರರ ಪರ ವಾದಮಾಡತಕ್ಕವರು ಆಂಧ್ರದ ಬೇಸಿಗೆ ರಾಜಧಾನಿಯಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವಷ್ಟು ಮುಂದೆ ಹೋದರೇ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಆಗ್ರಹಪಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ನಾವು ಭಾಷಾವಾರು ತತ್ವವನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಮೇಲೆ ಅದು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಸಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಜನರ ಖಚಿತವಾದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಹಾಗಿರುವ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಆಂಧ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಮಾವೇಶಗೊಳ್ಳುವುದರಿಂದ ನಮಗೆ ಯಾವ ನೋವು ಕೂಡ ಆಗಬಾರದು. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ನ್ಯಾಯ ಒಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು, ಒಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಅಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಲಾಭನಷ್ಟದ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದಲೂ ಕೂಡ ನೋಡಬಾರದು. ನಾವುಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ಮೊದಲೇ ಅಂದರೆ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಕಸಿವಿಸಿಯ ಮಾತು ಏನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ದೇಶ ಒಂದೇ ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ, ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ನ್ಯಾಷನ್ಯಾಲಿಟೀಸ್ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಅಥವಾ ಪರಸ್ಪರ ವೈಯುಕ್ತಿಕ ಹೋರಾಟದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಭಾಷಾವಾರು ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯ ರಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಕುರಿತು ಪ್ರತಿಪಾದಿಸುತ್ತೇವೋ ಅದೂ ಕೂಡ ಭಾರತದ ಒಗ್ಗಟ್ಟು ಮತ್ತು ಭದ್ರತೆಯ ನೀತಿಯನ್ನು ಒಳಗೊಂಡಿದೆ. ಇಂಥ ವಾದವನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂದಮೇಲೆ ನಾವು ಈ ದಿನ ಹಿಂದೆ ಯಾವ ಬ್ರಿಟಿಷರು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಲಿಟ್ಟು ತಮಗೆ ಮನಬಂದಂತೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ದೇಶವನ್ನು ಹರಿದು ಹಂಚಿದರು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಇತಿಹಾಸದಿಂದ ನೋಡಬಹುದು. ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಇವೊತ್ತು

ಕೂಡ ಒಂದು ರಾಜಕೀಯಪಕ್ಷ ಮತ್ತು ಕೆಲವು ಮುಖಂಡರು ಒಂದು key position ಅಥವಾ ಮೂಲ ಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅಂದ ಮಾತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರ ಇಷ್ಟಬಂದಂತೆ ಅಥವಾ ಅವರ ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವಂತೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಹಂಚಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರ ಸ್ವತ್ತಲ್ಲ ಅಥವಾ ಅವರು ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಕೂಡ ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಬಗೆಹರಿಯದೆ ಮತ್ತಷ್ಟು ತಿಕ್ಕಾಟವುಂಟಾಗಿ ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಮತ್ತೆ ಮತ್ತೆ ಕೆದಕಬೇಕಾದ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯುಂಟಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

2 P.M.

ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಮುಖಂಡರೂ, ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಪಕ್ಷಗಳೂ ಅಥವಾ ತಜ್ಞರು ಮಾಡಬಹುದಾದ ಒಂದು ಐತಿಹಾಸಿಕ ಅನ್ಯಾಯ, ತಪ್ಪು ಎಂದು ಹಿಂದಿನ ಚರಿತ್ರೆಯಿಂದ ನಾವು ಮನಗಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈಗ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿಯ ಚರಿತ್ರೆಯನ್ನೇ ನೋಡಬಹುದು, ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ಯುದ್ಧಾನಂತರ ಅದನ್ನು ಯಾವರೀತಿ ಹಂಚಿದರು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು. ಹೀಗೆಯೇ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಪ್ರಾಂತವೂ ಇದೇ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಹಂಚಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಇಡೀ ಭಾರತದ ಇತಿಹಾಸವನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೇ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಪ್ರಾಂತ, ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಕ್ಷಣದಲ್ಲಿ, ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಹಂಚಲ್ಪಟ್ಟು ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಎಲ್ಲೆಕಟ್ಟನ್ನು ಮಾಡಲಾಯಿತು ಎಂಬುದು ವ್ಯಕ್ತವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಅನ್ಯಾಯ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ, ಯಾರನ್ನು ಒಲಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಭಾರತದ ಪ್ರಾಂತಗಳ, ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಗಳ ರಚನೆ ಏರ್ಪಟ್ಟಿತು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಮನಗಂಡಿದ್ದೂ ಈಗ ಅದೇ ಸೋಗಿನಲ್ಲಿ, ಅದೇ ಮುಸುಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಂದುವರಿದು ಮತ್ತೆ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಮುಂದಿನ ಪೀಳಿಗೆ ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು, ನಾವಿಂದು ಬ್ರಿಟಿಷರನ್ನು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಸಂಚುಗಾರರೆಂದು ಟೀಕೆಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಯೋ, ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಟೀಕೆಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೇ ಅವಕಾಶಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಶಾಲಿನ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಅಡಕೆ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರ ಮಾಡುವಹಾಗೆ ಯಾವುದೇ ರೀತಿ ಮುಚ್ಚುಮರೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಇದು ಇವೊತ್ತು ಮಾಡಿ ನಾಳೆ ಬದಲಾಯಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯಲ್ಲ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದೂ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇತ್ಯರ್ಥವಾಗಬೇಕು. ಅದಕ್ಕೊಂದು ಸರಿಯಾದ ಎಲ್ಲೆಕಟ್ಟನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಮಾಣಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಅದು ಅನಂತಕಾಲದ ತನಕ ಮುಂದುವರಿದು ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾದದ್ದು. ಯಾವತ್ತೂ ಕೂಡ ಅಲ್ಪ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪದ ಸ್ವಾರ್ಥಕ್ಕೆ ಬಲಿಬಿದ್ದು ಈ ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು, ಯಾವತ್ತೂ ನಿರಂತರವಾಗಿ ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡುಹೋಗುವ ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು, ಬಗೆಹರಿಸಕೂಡದು. ಸ್ವಾರ್ಥಕ್ಕೆ ಎಡೆಗೊಡದೆ ಹಿಂದು ಮುಂದು ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ನಷ್ಟವಾಗಲಿ, ವೈಮನಸ್ಯವಾಗಲಿ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಉಂಟಾಗದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಗೆಹರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾವು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಪಡಬೇಕು. ಇದು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಇವೊತ್ತು ಆಳತಕ್ಕ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಮತ್ತು ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯ ಮುಖಂಡರುಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಬಹುಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ನಿಂತಿದೆಯೆಂದು ನಂಬಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Do you not think it is too general? Please speak on the merits of the amendment.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಇದನ್ನೇಕೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಇವೊತ್ತು ಶ್ರೀ ಮುಲ್ಕ ಗೋವಿಂದರೆಡ್ಡಿಯವರಾಗಲಿ, ಶ್ರೀ ನಾರಾಯಣರೆಡ್ಡಿಯವರಾಗಲಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ವಿರೋಧಿಸಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರೆಂದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ನೇರವಾಗಿ ನೀವು ಕಮ್ಯೂನಿಸ್ಟರಾಗಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ಅಥವಾ ಕಮ್ಯೂನಿಸ್ಟರ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಾದಮಾಡಲು ಹೊರಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎಂದು ಅವರನ್ನು ಆರೋಪಿಸುವ ವಾದವನ್ನು ನಾವೀಗ ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಅದಿಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೂ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಬಣ್ಣ ಬಳಿಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರಟಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಪರಿಹಾರವಾಗದೆ ಪ್ರಗತಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕುಂಠಿತವಾಗಿದೆ, ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದರಿಂದಾಗಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನರ ಆಶೋತ್ತರಗಳು ಮಣ್ಣುಗೂಡಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಭಾಷಾವಾರು ಪ್ರಾಂತರಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಆಡಳಿತ, ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಿ, ಭೌಗೋಳಿಕ—ಇವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಗಣನೆಯಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಆಧುನಿಕ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾಂತಗಳನ್ನು ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡೋಣವೆಂಬ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಕೂಡ ಪದೇ ಪದೇ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ತೊಡಕಿಗೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿ ಅದು ಕಾಲುಕೈಗಳ ಜಜ್ಜಿ ಹಿಸಿಯುವ ಹಾಗಾಗಿ ತಪ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗದಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ದುಃಖದಿಂದ ನೋಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗೆ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯ ಭಾಷಣಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಬಣ್ಣಬಳಿಯುತ್ತಾರೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡುತ್ತಾ ಅಸಹಾಯಕ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ದೇಶದವರಿದ್ದಾರೆ! ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ, ನಾನು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುವುದಿಷ್ಟು. ಮುಚ್ಚುಮರೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ಯಾವ ವಿಷಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ; ಮತ್ತು ಲಾಭನಷ್ಟದ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಕೂಡ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಆಂಧ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಭಾಗ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಭಾಗ ಅದು ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕಕ್ಕೂ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಬ್ಬರ ಏಳಿಗೆಯಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಮತ್ತೊಬ್ಬರ ಏಳಿಗೆಯೂ ಇದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಅರಿತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಒಬ್ಬರು ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬರನ್ನು ಮೆಟ್ಟಿ, ತುಳಿದು ದೇಶಕಟ್ಟಬೇಕು, ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರನಿರ್ಮಾಣ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶಪಡತಕ್ಕ ಯುಗವನ್ನು ನಾವು ದಾಟಿ ಬಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇವತ್ತು ಒಂದು ಸಂಯುಕ್ತ (Federal) ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗವನ್ನು ನಾವು ಅಳವಡಿಸಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಮತ್ತು ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವವನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡು ಅದರಂತೆ ನಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿದ್ಧರಾಗಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ಲೆಬಿಸೈಟ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಒಬ್ಬರು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ, ಅದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದನ್ನೂ ನಾವು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಪ್ಲೆಬಿಸೈಟ್ ಎಂಬುದು ಖರ್ಚಿನದು, ಅನೇಕ ಕಷ್ಟ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳನ್ನೊಳಗೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತವೆಂದೂ ನಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಆದರೂ ನಾವು ಆರಿಸಿದ ಮುಖಂಡರುಗಳು ದೇಶದ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳನ್ನು ತಾವೇ ಬಗೆಹರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಹಕ್ಕನ್ನು ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ಎಂಬುದೂ ನಾವು ನೋಡಬೇಕಾದ ಒಂದು ಮುಖ್ಯ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—So far as the question of time for each speaker was concerned, it was left to my discretion. May I now say that no speech shall exceed 15 minutes under any circumstances?

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO (Tumkur).—Ordinarily.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK (Molakalmuru).—He was arguing about the amendments which were defeated in the House. We are now to offer our remarks either in support of the amendment moved by Sri Imam or against it. He is arguing about plebiscite and its utility, its advantages and all that. I raise a point of order that he can limit himself to the scope of the amendment before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He had come prepared for a general debate and he had not been given an opportunity. Please speak on the merits of the amendment. You may take 2 or 3 minutes more.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಪ್ಲೆಬಿಸೈಟಿನ ವಿಷಯ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೆ. ಈ ಕೆಲವು ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಯುಗದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ—ಗ್ರೀಕ್ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್ ಸ್ವಿಟ್ಸರ್‌ಲೆಂಡ್ ಅಥವಾ ಇನ್ನಾವುದೇ ದೇಶಬಿಟ್ಟರೂ—ಉಳಿದ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೀಗೆ ಪ್ಲೆಬಿಸೈಟಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ಬಗೆಹರಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳು ಉದ್ಭವಿಸಬಹುದು. ಪರಸ್ಪರ ಒಪ್ಪಂದ ಇಲ್ಲದಿರುವಾಗ ದೇಶದ ಜನರ ಅಭಿಮತವನ್ನು ಕ್ರೋಢೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇಂಥ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಹರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ಲೆಬಿಸೈಟನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲೇಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಂದಮಾತ್ರಕ್ಕೇ ಇವೊತ್ತು ಈ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳನ್ನು ಹಂಚಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಕುತೂಹಲದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಸಿಕ್ಕಲಿ ತಮಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಸಿಕ್ಕಲಿ ಎನ್ನುವ ಭರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಇದನ್ನು ಬಗೆಹರಿಸಲಾಗದೆ, U. N. O. ವರೆಗೂ ಇದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಿ ಕಾಶ್ಮೀರದ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯಷ್ಟು ದೊಡ್ಡದಾಗಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಆಶೆಯೇನೂ ನಮಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಎರಡೂ ಜನರು ಬಲವತ್ತರವಾದ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಂದ ವಾದಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ; ಮತ್ತು ನಾವೂ ಅಸಹಾಯಕರಾಗಿದ್ದು ನಮ್ಮ ತೀರ್ಮಾನದ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಜನತೆ ಶಂಕೆ ಪಡುವಾಗ ಒಂದು ಪ್ಲೆಬಿಸೈಟ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಆ ಮುಖಾಂತರವೇ ಬಗೆಹರಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಇದ್ದೇ ಇರುತ್ತವೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಒತ್ತಾಯಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯವೇನೆಂದರೆ: ಈ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳನ್ನು ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಪ್ರಾಂತಗಳಿಗೆ ಹಂಚಬೇಕೆಂಬ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಅಥವಾ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಬೌಂಡ್ರಿ ಕಮಿಷನ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಕೂಡಲೇ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ರಚನೆಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಅನೇಕ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳು ಉದ್ಭವಿಸುವುದು ಖಂಡಿತ ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಭಾಷಾವಾರು ಪ್ರಾಂತ ರಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಆಂಧ್ರ ಪ್ರಾಂತ ರಚನೆಯ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲೇ ಬಗೆಹರಿಸುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಸೂಕ್ತ. ಇಲ್ಲದೆ, ಇದನ್ನು ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ವಿಳಂಬವಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಯಾವ ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರಾಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳೂ ಕೂಡ ಕೈಗೂಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ; ಬದಲು, ರಾಜಕೀಯಪಕ್ಷ ಪ್ರತಿಪಕ್ಷಗಳೂ, ಬಣ್ಣಗಳೂ, ತೊಡಕುಗಳೂ ಹುಟ್ಟಿ ಇಡೀ ಭಾರತದಲ್ಲೇ ಅಲ್ಲೋಲಕಲ್ಲೋಲ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯುಂಟಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾವೇ ಅವಕಾಶಮಾಡಿಕೊಟ್ಟಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾನಿ ಉಂಟಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹಾಗೂ ಜನಸಾಮಾನ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ನಷ್ಟವುಂಟಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನಾನು ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಈ ಎಲ್ಲ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಬಹಳ ವಿನಯಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾ, ನನಗೆ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರನ್ನು ವಂದಿಸಿ ನನ್ನ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.—Sir, the amedment that has been proposed by Sri Imam and supported by others reads like this :

> "That clauses 3 and 4 be so amended as to provide for the transfer of the whole of Bellary District as also of South Kanara District, Kollegal, Madakasira and Kalyandurga taluks, Nilgiris and Hosur to the State of Mysore."

If the amendment ran only with regard to South Kanara District, Kollegal or Nilgiris, I would not have opposed. The three taluks that have been decided to be included in Andhra and Kalyandurga taluk of which no dispute has arisen and which is a part of Anantapur District and Housur have, of which there is a dispute been included in this amendment. The mover of this amendment tried to make out a case that these three areas must come to Mysore State, because, he said, that predominantly Kannada-speaking people live in those areas. So, Sir, the principle underlying this amendment is that the carving of provinces on the basis of language should be accepted. When such is the case, I do not know with what reason can anybody oppose the opting out of Telugu areas out of the province to the Andhra State. The three taluks in Bellary District that are included in this amendment are predominantly Telugu-spea ing areas. Kalyandurga is a predominantly Telugu-speaking area and Hosur is also a predominantly Telugu-speaking area. These areas should naturally go to Andhra and other areas come to Mysore provided Mysore people decide that there should be a province of Karnataka on

the basis of language. The Chief Minister made some allegations against the stand that I took. He imputed that the stand that I took was the one advocated by communists. It may be true that the communists are advocating the policy of linguistic provinces or the principle of linguistic provinces. The same is the case with Congress leaders. The same is the case with Socialist leaders. The same was the case with Sri Hanumanthaiya when he made a speech at Nanalnagar and also when he made a similar speech at Mangalore. When he made that speech, was he inspired by the communist idealogies ? It is always the case for the ruling party, for vested interests, to taboo any progressive movement as a communist bogey. In this respect, I should like to recall that our revered leader, Pandit Nehru, who took such an important lead in establishing peace in Korea, was dubbed as a communist by that arch-reactionary Dr. Syngh-man Rhee. So, it is always the case for vested interests, to taboo any progressive movement as a communist bogey. In this respect if Sri Hanumanthaiya too dubs this progressive movement as communist and evades his responsibility, I only feel sorry for him and not for myself. After having clarified that stand, I would say that when this amendment includes some Telugu areas, I am bound to oppose. It is my duty to oppose this amendment. If only the Kannada areas had been included in this amendment, I would not have opposed ; on the other hand, I would have supported it. As this amendment includes some telugu areas also, I am opposing it.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I have listened with great interest to the point of view put forward by Sri Imam, Leader of the Opposition. I may straightaway say that I am in agreement with the logic and the conclusion he placed before this House. I also think that this question should have been tackled once and for all without giving room for controversies to rise repeatedly. These linguistic controversies make for bitterness and they disturb the peace of the country. In fact, Sir, as soon as the question of formation of Andhra State was taken, they should have taken the whole question of redistribution of territory in India. Instead of that the Government of India took, as they themselves say, as a first step the formation of Andhra State. I did not agree with the reasoning put forward by the Prime Minister that Andhra State must be formed and after it proves a success and it gets going then we must think of other States. That is hardly the logic that is applicable to the facts of this case. The formation of each State depends upon a number of factors. There are no similar problems to be faced. In fact, if Tamil State is to be formed, there is one set of circumstances ; if Kerala State is to be formed, there is another set of circumstances. Similarly if Karnataka State is to be formed, there are different sets of circumstances. Therefore, we ought to have tackled the question of linguistic states on a basis to be agreed upon between Governments concerned and the Government of India. But, that is after all our view of things. Whatever that may be, the Government of India has taken a stand now and that stand is made clear by the provisions of the Bill. What the Bill envisages today is merely the carving of Andhra State out of the existing Madras State. It does not tackle any other problem, such as the formation of Karnataka province or Visala Andhra or the problem of Aikya Kerala or other States. Therefore, the scope of the Bill is restricted to carving out Andhra State out of the undisputed districts thereof. Therefore, Sir, this is not the proper time or the stage for us to enlarge the scope of discussion or the scope of the Bill. For that, there is a separate forum ; there is a separate arrangement made. For example, the Government of India is going to appoint a Boundary Commission That Boundary Commission can certainly go into the question of these

(SRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA.)

Taluks of Bellary, namely, Alur, Adoni and Rayadurg. It also can go into the question of Madakasira. That is to say, if we correctly interpret the declaration of the Prime Minister in Parliament, even the Boundary Commission is restricted to Madras Presidency *vis-a-vis* the Andhra State and the Mysore State. The Boundary Commission cannot go into the question of Kolar District or any other District because it is the undisputed districts in Madras State that have been constituted into a separate administrative unit. The other questions which my Hon'ble friend Sri Mohamed Imam envisages in his amendment come up for consideration before the High Power Committee that is going to be appointed. Then, once for all, we are going to tackle this problem as to what territory should come into Mysore State and what territory should form one particular State or the other. Therefore, let us not mix up the issues now. The Bill itself is called 'Andhra State Bill'. We are discussing it not as a main proposition in this House; but incidentally seven taluks expressed their wish that they want to come into Mysore State and therefore the Government of India are handing over these seven taluks irrespective of the question of the formation of Greater Mysore or the formation of a Karnataka State. I would therefore appeal to him to restrict himself for the time being to the scope of the Bill. The scope of the Bill, as I have already said, does not cover Kollegal, Hosur or Nilgiris. They are not contiguous to the State of Andhra that is going to be formed. It is only contiguous territories to Andhra that come up for consideration before the Boundary Commission. Sir, as I said in my reply speech, we have to go very carefully, cautiously and more than all, wisely. If we precipitate issues, we shall be treading the ground of controversy. Controversy breeds many a time bitterness and I do not want that Greater Mysore or Karnataka State or whatever name you may give it should emerge out of any bitterness of feelings. We should avoid that atmosphere as far as possible. Let us now restrict ourselves to the scope of this Bill. When the Boundary Commission is appointed, it will go into the question of these three Taluks and also Madakasira which are contiguous to the Andhra State that is going to be formed and the Mysore State. Then before the High Power Committee that is going to be appointed after the 1st October, we shall place, if necessary, our views in regard to Nilgiris, Kollegal, South Kanara and other adjoining territories. I would place another consideration before them. We are committed to the policy of not being aggressive and ambitious and it is primarily the willingness of the people concerned that should ultimately weigh in this matter. Let the people of Nilgiri District, let the people of Kollegal Taluk and let the people of South Kanara District and various other adjoining districts express definitely and constitutionally their ideas as to which State they want to go. When that approach is made to proper quarters—proper quarters is primarily the Government of India—then the Government of India will certainly ask what our opinion is in the matter. Then we shall give our reply. It is at that stage, as I have been promising, that I want to place the whole matter before this House as well as the other House for discussion and decision. Sir, let us follow this logical course that has been laid down by the Prime Minister of India and the Government of India. For purposes of clarification, Sir, I would read out the speech of the Prime Minister himself. The Prime Minister made a statement in the House of the People on 25th March 1953, in regard to the establishment of Andhra State. He has stated therein :—

> "The Government of India had decided to establish the Andhra State consisting of the Telugu-speaking areas of the present Madras State."

In the course of the statement he has used phrases as follows :—

> "It should consist of Telugu-speaking areas of the present Madras State. The Andhra State therefore is to consist of what may be called the undisputed Telugu-speaking areas of the present Madras State. At a subsequent stage, the Boundary Commission or Commissions may have to be appointed to determine the exact boundaries of this new State."

It is, therefore, clear that this new State can be carved out of the Madras State only. Therefore, there are many amendments indirectly hinting that portions of Mysore Territory also can be taken to form Andhra, or Visala Andhra and things like that. It is not so. The Andhra State has nothing to do with Mysore State and *vice-versa*. It is only out of the existing Madras State that Andhra State is going to be carved out. Therefore, there is no question whatever of taking even one inch of Mysore territory at this stage to Andhra State or to any other State. Equally, there is no question of Mysore wanting to get any more territories than the ones given by the Government of India at this stage. Sir, I hope that since the Hon'ble Member Sri Mohamed Imam's views and approach to the problem are the same as mine, and only there is procedural difference, I expect he will agree with me in substance and leave the form to take care of itself. I therefore request him, Sir, to withdraw his amendment.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Shall I make a short statement ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Of course, it is not usually allowed. Since the Member is going to withdraw the amendment, as a special case I allow him. But let it not serve as a precedent.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—My only anxiety is this. This Bill has been placed before us with a view to ascertain our views on this Bill. Our views must be before the Parliament before they take up the consideration of this Bill and the only way to ascertaining our views by the Parliament is through amendments and through resolutions.

2-30 P.M.

I am sure that all the Members of this House including the Chief Minister are for this amendment and they are anxious that these three taluks should go to Bellary District. We are also anxious and all the members of this House are unanimous that the other Kannada-speaking areas also must go to Mysore. But my only concern is, how should the Parliament be appraised of our views that we are anxious to see that these questions are settled and they are added to Mysore State. So, I want to make it clear....

Mr. SPEAKER.—We have our representatives in the Parliament.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Yes. It is almost the unanimous view of this House that the spirit of this amendment should be represented by our representatives there and the fact that I am going to withdraw this amendment should not mean that the House is against this amendment.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Nor am I.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—So the substance of our discussion must be let known to the Members of the Parliament and they should take our views into consideration. I am going to withdraw this amendment because of the appeal made by the Chief Minister who said that these are questions which are going to be examined in future and that the Boundary Commission will examine the question of these three taluks and similar other areas. So, I request the Chief Minister that when he sends these things, let him......

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—I will, Sir.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—..........send that it is the almost unanimous opinion of this House, with the exception of two or three Members. I request him to send copies

(Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.)

of my speech and his speech to the Members of the Parliament. I withdraw the amendment with the permission of this House.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment No. 6. The Hon'ble Members are not going to move it.

Then, amendment No. 7 stands in the name of Sri B. V. Narayana Reddy. The first half of the amendment is covered in the third amendment and the second half is covered in the fourth amendment. It is not, therefore, in order. It has to be disallowed and I do so.

Sri B. V. NARAYANA REDDY (Bagepalli—Gudibanda).—I have added Coorg, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is my ruling. If you want to say anything ......

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—No, Sir, he does not want to say anything. (*Laughter.*)

Mr. SPEAKER.—Not regarding the amendment, but about the ruling. I do not want to exercise my extraordinary powers, though I have got special powers. But, in view of the reason I have given I cannot allow this amendment.

Then, amendment No. 11 stands in the name of the Chief Minister.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I beg to move:

> "That in Clause 4 in sub-clause (2) for the words 'the extent and boundaries of districts' the words 'the extents, boundaries, names and the number of Districts in the State' shall be substituted."

This is merely not to restrict, by reason of this sub-clause, our powers to extend the boundaries of the Districts or to rename them or to increase or decrease the number of districts in the State. If these words are not added, it reads as though we are competent to change only the extent and boundary of that district and nothing else. Therefore, this amendment clarifies the existing position constitutionally and legally. I commend this amendment to the acceptance of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

> "That in Clause 4 in sub-clause (2) for the words 'the extent and boundaries of districts' the words 'the extents, boundaries, names and the number of Districts in the State' shall be substituted."

Sri MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.—Sir, I do not see the necessity of this amendment for these reasons. Clause 4 (2) reads:

> "Without prejudice to the power of the State Government to alter hereafter the extent and boundaries of districts, the transferred territory shall form a separate district to be known as Bellary District."

It is very clear. Absolute power is vested with the Government of Mysore to alter at any time the extent and boundaries of any district, not only of this district but any district in Mysore State. We are all aware that some territory was added to Gudibanda and that power did vest with the Government of Mysore. So, there is no necessity to amend the present Clause. Hence, I feel it is not necessary to amend the clause and so I oppose this amendment.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—As Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy said, the State has got absolute power in regard to formation of districts whether extent or boundaries or any other problem relating to that. But, this is going to be a Parliamentary enactment. If this Bill is passed, our power is going to be restricted only to the question of extent and boundaries of the Bellary District. Therefore, if this clause is passed as it is by the Parliament, the existing powers are going to be curtailed. For example, we may appoint a Commission

to rearrange the districts in the State; we may decrease their number or we may increase their number and rename. This power will be taken away if the present clause is adopted as it is. It is in order to retain the existing power without any doubt in the matter that I have brought this amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

> "That in clause 4, in sub-clause (2), for the words 'the extent and boundaries of district', the words 'the extents, boundaries, names and the number of Districts in the State' shall be substituted."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment No. 13—Sri Anjaneya Reddy. The Member is not present. Besides, it is not in order according to the ruling I have given regarding the third amendment. For the same reason, I also disallow this amendment, Amendments 14, 15 and 16 are not moved. Therefore, the question is:

> "That clauses 3 and 4, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.— Clause 5. There is no amendment to clause 5. The question is:

> "That clause 5 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 6. There is an amendment in the name of Sri H. S. Rudrappa.

Sri H. S. RUDRAPPA (Honnali).—I am not moving, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—So clauses 6 to 21. There are no amendments. The question is:

> "That clauses 6 to 21...."

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN (Kolar).—Though there are no amendments to clauses 21 and 22, still they are important matters which may have to be clarified. For instance clause 21. I have made some indication even in my opening remarks on the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—So, I will put Clauses 6 to 20. The question is:

> "That clauses 6 to 20, both inclusive, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 21.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—Mr. Speaker, in regard to these clauses, 21 and 22, particularly clause 22, there is one important matter which must engross the attention of this House. Of course, in a way I have indicated it in my remarks while speaking on the first motion in respect of this Bill. I would like to clarify the position further.

Here we are asked to give our support which amounts to this. To-day, some gentlemen have been elected from certain constituencies, as was ordered in the State of Mysore. For instance, there is the Graduates' Constituency and taking the State as a whole, some members have been elected to the Mysore Legislative Council. So also from the Local Authorities' Constituency of the Chitaldrug District, some members have been elected to the Legislative Council. But what is mentioned in clause 22 is, those who are already so elected as representing the Graduates' Constituency of the Mysore State and the Local Authorities' Constituency of Chitaldrug District shall be deemed to have been elected to that Council by the areas of Mysore with the territories proposed to be added. This raises two questions. One is, whether it should be competent for the Legislature of this State to pass a law of this kind. Possibly I might concede that it may be quite in order. But, apart from that, because it is a matter which has come up in a form before the Supreme Court of India in regard to PEPSU affair relating to a matter of this kind, I would rather leave that matter open and not express myself

(SRI K. PATTABHIRAMAN.)

on it, because the Supreme Court is going to decide the matter one way or the other. But, apart from that, there is another issue which I wish this House should consider. Is it possible to allow a law of this kind? Particularly when the Government in power has a large majority of its party behind it—I hope the Chief Minister and the party will not take it amiss, I am only elucidating the point as it were—supposing the party in Government, with a majority backing behind it brings forward a legislation and says that such and such a constituency, though it will not for the time being follow the procedure and the rules and go through the gamut of elections, shall declare that such and such a person or persons shall be deemed to be elected from it; can a law of that kind be in the interest of the country? Can it be in accordance with the principles of democracy? This is an issue which this House has to consider. So I am raising this issue. And I am making it clear not with reference to Mysore State, but generally, because I feel that this may be quoted as precedent here later. If by a legislative enactment you take away the electoral right granted to a group of persons, I feel that that is something which we must battle against, which we must dissent from. That is the view I am placing before the House. Let us take a step further, you may say. How best to meet the immediate contingency? The seven taluks will be coming to Mysore. And it is not possible in the immediate context of affairs to arrange for any kind of election to take place so as to enable the representatives of these taluks to come as representatives of the constituencies concerned by election in the usual course. Therefore that situation requires reconsideration of the procedure by adopting which for some time to come, it may be very difficult to secure representation. It may be argued thus. But if that difficulty should be the sole test by which we are going to decide the issue, I am afraid that the remedies that we are offering will be worse than the disease and that, I feel, would not be a happy way of doing this thing. In fact there are several instances. The other day I was discussing with an eminent authority for whom I have the greatest respect, this problem and he gave me one instance of a place in America having no representation in the Assembly of America. Some of you may remember that Washington, the city of cities in America, because of some such difficulty, went without representation in the Assembly of America. Even so I think that a similar difficulty would have arisen in the case of Delhi City but it has been made a 'C' State while constituting it as a State. Sitting as we are in this House, can we allow the Parliament to pass such legislation? No. It may be quoted as precedent against us tomorrow. It is quite possible that a party in power, with its manœuvrings as we see—some of us may not believe in the party system of Government,—which has to administer the country, may arm the Government with legislation of this kind. But we should not arm the Government with such legislation. Into the legality or constitutionality of the matter, I am not going in now. But still I want it to be clearly understood that even in respect of Bellary it must be a temporary matter. And I expect so far as this House is concerned, including the Chief Minister, as it is a question of principle apart from other considerations, it would dissent from granting power to pass legislation of this kind. Otherwise, it would be undemocratic, it would not be appreciated and would not be in accordance with the growing feeling in our people where representation is always thought of not as something which is merely blank as it were but something very substantial, something very fundamental, something going to affect the vitals of the

democratic principles in the country and the well-being of the country. In that view of the matter I would request the Hon'ble Minister concerned and the Chief Minister to consider that this kind of legislative sanction, apart from its constitutionality or legality, is something which we must express dissatisfaction from and even if it is a measure of expediency—I really concede it, these friends who come from Bellary go unrepresented—this proposed representation is something which in my opinion is quite illusory. Excepting meeting a contingency, I do not really understand how it gives any other advantage whatever to the people of Bellary. To say that their representatives are already there in the Legislative Council is a fiction. You are including something and are giving representation to them which is quite illusory. I ask, can we resort to a legal fiction of this kind in order to create a case of representation where otherwise it does not confer any advantage to the persons who are going to come to Mysore. So, in that view of the matter, unless we express our dissent, we will be failing in our duty and therefore I am bringing this to your notice. That is why I have not tabled any amendment, because I did not want to embarrass you. Because there is a feeling that the Central Parliament should not be armed with such wide and extraordinary authority, extraordinary power as to say that a person who is elected from a constituency in our State or anywhere else shall be deemed to have been elected by virtue of a parliamentary enactment. I request you to consider the propriety of clothing the Parliament with that power. We must resist giving such power.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I have an amendment to clause 22 on a similar issue. I would bring it to the notice of the Chair that there is an amendment in my name on a similar issue. I think it has to be taken up. It deals with the specific matter of allotting one seat to the Legislative Council of Mysore to the Bellary District Local Authorities.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—So far as the remedy asked for, I do not know if I am saying something which might appear to be acceptable. Possibly, as things stand, for some time to come they must go without representation. What is it that we are offering to the people of Bellary Taluk to send their representatives in the Legislative Council? Why say that the graduates already elected to the Legislative Council, who are already there for the past 15 months, shall be deemed to have been elected from the Bellary Taluk also? These interjections and exclamations I can understand; my sympathies are born out of them. I really appreciate them. But does it really mean anything substantial for those seven taluks? What I am saying is, it is only creating a legal fiction in constitutional history by saying that part of the people are represented. That will not be real; that will be a purly legal fiction. Friends here will agree, I hope, with my opinion. But still I feel that this kind of legislation is a legal fiction, purely illusory, does not offer any advantage at all. It is as good as saying that they may go without representation. I am asking the House to appreciate if by a statute of this kind you give the Parliament authority, what is it that you are really registering your support for? As persons who are bent upon setting up democratic traditions in this country, you have to consider the question not merely from the point of view of the seven taluks going without representation but from the larger interests, which you must care for. I ask you, I beseach you and I request my friends not to clothe the Parliament with an authority like that. It may be all right to-day. But it is possible it may be abused tomorrow. It may be even misused day after tomorrow.

I ask you, Hon'ble Members of this Hon'ble House, not to clothe the Parliament with this authority. It

(SRI K. PATTABHIRAMAN.)

is possible that it can be misused and we must also prevent such embrrassment even to the Parliament. Therefore, I ask this House the only alternative as I understand is for the Chief Minister—perhaps it may be that his wisdom will give a solution to the problem—the Chief Minister may suggest a *via media*. If that is done and if a proper solution could be found for this, nobody would be happier than myself. But speaking for myself, I must say that you must allow them to remain unrepresented for sometime unless some other solution could be found. I hope the Constitution is not so helpless. It is quite possible that it is a matter which has to be taken up at another level and a higher level. I do not know if I will be insulting the Members of the Treasury Benches here, if I say that the Chief Minister may have to take up this matter at a higher level at Delhi. You know that Delhi is at a higher level; I think its altitude is also higher.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Altitude is not higher.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—But time is not for distant when Delhi will have to move down to Hyderabad and let us look forward to the time when Delhi ceases to be so distant. Possibly when it comes nearer to Hyderabad as it must—it is going to be the future capital of India—this is a matter, I feel, that has to be taken up at a higher level. Therefore I feel that this is a matter which must engage the attention of this House.

Sri P. R. RAMAIYA (Basavangudi).—Why do you make an invidious distinction between the two Houses? You want them for the Assembly, but you do not want them for the Council?

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—I have to say that no body has given more support to my argument than my esteemed friend Sri P. R. Ramaiya. That is exactly my difficulty. When you are allowing them to come and sit in the Legislative Assembly you do so because they have been duly elected to the Madras Assembly. But in respect of the Mysore Legislative Council you do not want them to come and sit. You say that people who have been elected without any reference to the Bellary people, shall be deemed to have been elected and they will be deemed to represent the people of Bellary District also. That is why I said it is a 'legal fiction'.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY (Mysore City—South).—The other one is also a fiction.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—I am sorry it is not a fiction. There are elected representatives from these seven taluks to the Legislative Assembly of Madras, under the same procedure and Rules under which we have all been elected to this House. The Bill says, hereafter instead of sitting in the Madras Assembly, they will sit in the Mysore Legislative Assembly. In other respects, there is absolutely no difference. It is only in the case of the Legislative Council this legal fiction as I said is sought to be invented in order to meet the change. According to that, the Parliament assumes the power to say that the Chitaldrug representatives will be also deemed to represent Bellary people. I say this is dangerous. Therefore I appeal to this House to make this position clear and I hope the Chief Minister also will appreciate the position and extend such support as he may think best.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO (Tumkur).—I have no objection to speak after the Chief Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER.—No, you can go on. The Chief Minister will speak after you.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—Sir, Sri Pattabhiraman, if I may say so with great respect to him, has raised a very important point and it is rather disappointing that none of us has tabled any specific amendment which would put us in any better position.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—I have explained my position. I said I deliberately did not do so.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—Sir, I meant no insinuation. I said that it is rather disappointing that none of us has tabled an amendment and I have included myself in it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Both of you are correct.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—The point raised by Sri Pattabhiraman certainly cannot be characterised as wanting in substance. It is a substantial point that is raised. The clause merely says that the Members who have been elected from these territories that are going to be transferred to Mysore to the Madras Legislative Assembly, will take their seats in this House. It is true that their election has proceeded from territorial constituencies and it is hardly justifiable that members similarly elected, whether from territorial or other constituencies to the Upper House, as for instances from the Teachers' Constituency or the Local Authorities' Constituency, should be shut out from the Upper House of this State, since we have an Upper House in this State. Madras has a Second Chamber and Mysore has a Second Chamber and elections to the Second Chambers of both these States have been prescribed and have been held in the same manner and under the provisions of the same Central legislative enactment. That being so, it is really curious to find that some difficulties seem to have arisen in the minds of those who framed this Bill and not merely have they not made any provision for the Members elected to the Madras Legislative Council from the transferred territory taking their seats in the Mysore Legislative Council, but they have gone further and said that that shall not be the case and Members who have been elected from Chitaldrug District to the Mysore Legislative Council ought to be deemed to have been elected from the constituencies contained in the Chitaldrug District as enlarged by the addition of the territory to be transferred. That, as Mr. Pattabhiraman has pointed out, is certainly a legal fiction. Of course, legal fictions are useful in themselves when it suits us. But I suppose we ought to find a much more tenable argument in respect of this clause instead of leaving it as it is. It is true that none of us has tabled any amendment. But I am sure that this difficulty will not and should not preclude the Government in turn to suggest that the consideration of this particular clause may be held over to a later stage in this very debate itself so as to enable the Government to reflect upon it and to consider if there is any suitable amendment which would perhaps necessitate some amendment to the Representation of the People Act which fixes the number of seats to the Legislative Council in Mysore. This also ought not to present any particular difficulty because while so many important matters are being provided for by this Bill, we can certainly take action for amending the Representation of the People Act in order to enable these members from the Bellary area to take their seats in the Legislative Council of Mysore State. On principle I feel there cannot be any objection to it. If we have no objection to five or six or seven members elected from the transferred territory to come and sit in the Mysore Legislative Assembly, on principle none of us can raise any objection or protest against one or two or whatever may be the number coming to take their seats in the Legislative Council of our State.

3 P.M.

Sri Pattabhiraman suggested that this might involve arrangements at a higher level and he referred to Delhi altitude but I do not know if he meant it. He said higher altitude or something of that kind. What really he had in mind is perhaps higher latitude. Delhi is 23 degrees North while Mysore and Madras are near about 13 or 14 degrees North. That way Delhi is certainly higher up and I entirely agree with him that Hyderabad is more propitious and convenient

(SRI M. V. RAMA RAO.)

as the capital for carrying on the Government of the Union. In fact, I would go further and say that Bangalore would be more convenient and when it does come down to Bangalore, we may feel as self-important as people in Delhi seem to feel. About this particular thing, this principle is entirely justifiable unless, as I expect the Chief Minister to do, he can point out any constitutional or other legal difficulties which prevent our taking any more members to the Legislative Council.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—I am one with my Hon'ble friends Sri Pattabhiraman and Sri Rama Rao in conceding that the principle accepted has not been implemented here. There is no doubt whatever on that point, (Sri M. V. Rama Rao.—Thank you) and I whole-heartedly agree with them that it is not right in a democratic country to make any particular piece of territory go unrepresented in the Legislature while due representation is given to other parts of the State. These are principles on which there is complete agreement between the two Hon'ble speakers and me. I examined this question thoroughly from this point of view. But as was rightly anticipated by my Hon'ble friends Sriyuts Rama Rao and Pattabhiraman, there is constitutional difficulty in the way, which is almost insurmountable. I would invite their attention to article 171 of the Constitution :

> "171. (1) The total number of members in the Legislative Council of a State having such a Council shall not exceed one-fourth of the total number of members of the Legislative Assembly of that State :
>
> "Provided that the total number of members in the Legislative Council of a State shall in no case be less than forty."

Leaving out the Proviso, if we take only the main article into consideration, we are entitled to have only 25 members in the Legislative Council. By reason of the Proviso the number in the Legislative Council is inflated as it were to the tune of the minimum fixed, namely, 40. Now, if article 171 and its proviso have force, we cannot increase the number even by one beyond the figure 40. There are already forty members in the Legislative Council. If we add one or two more members from Bellary District, it becomes unconstitutional in the face of the clear provision of Art. 171. It is only when an amendment of the Constitution is effected we can have the number increased. There are only two alternatives now. If it is merely the Representation of the People Act, which delimits constituencies, that is to be amended, it can be easily done, as Sri Rama Rao said. A provision like that can be added to this Bill because an Act can be modified by another Act of Parliament. It is now Article 171 of the Constitution that is in the way. Unless you amend that article by the prescribed procedure under the Constitution you cannot increase the number beyond 40. Therefore, the other course open to us is to dissolve the Legislative Council and then amend the Representation of the People Act so as to create another constituency for Bellary in the Representation of the People Act ; then hold a fresh election ; then the Legislative Council can contain 40 and yet have due representation for Bellary Taluk. Suppose you adopt that course, then the Legislative work comes to a stand-still until the new Legislative Council is constituted, because the Parliament has to amend the Act. Then we have to delimit afresh the constituencies in Mysore State so far as the Legislative Council is concerned ; then calendar of events has to be issued and elections have to be held. That will take not less than a year, if you work out at Government level these various steps. Then we cannot hold a budget session of the Assembly, we cannot pass the budget ; Government work comes to a stand still on the first of April. Therefore it is in the face of this

insuperable constitutional difficulty that this legal fiction has been resorted to. Hon'ble Members will therefore see that we have no other go except to accept the Clause as it is. If it were possible for me to do so, I would certainly have brought an amendment. There is another insuperable difficulty. If you include a provision in this Bill for the dissolution of the Legislative Council, it may be we may agree, but the other House will not agree.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—The other House need not be consulted.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—I have explained the constitutional position which prevents us from giving due representation to Bellary District in the Legislative Council for the time being. I might also add there are other constitutional provisions in the Constitution itself which allow for such things in case there are such difficulties. Article 212 (1) of the Constitution says :

> " The validity of any proceedings in the Legislature of a State shall not be called in question on the ground of any alleged irregularity of procedure."

Then there is Art. 189 (2) :

> " A House of the Legislature of a State shall have power to act notwithstanding any vacancy in the membership thereof, ..."

Legally there is no difficulty. Just as there is a vacancy in the case of a pending bye-election in any Legislature, even if there is a vacancy in the Legislative Council, that is not either unconstitutional or illegal. That is the technical point I was making. So far as the principle is concerned, I have conceded it. Therefore they have to concede the constitutional difficulty and accept the Clause as it

Mr. SPEAKER.—You please read Art. 171. The number cannot exceed 26 or 29 even according to the increased number.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Therefore it is out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is a matter for him to consider ; I cannot say it is out of order. Anyhow, so far as clause 21 is concerned, there can be no objection. The question is :

> " That Clause 21 stand part of the Bill ".

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House will now rise for lunch and meet again at 3-40 P.M.

The House rose for lunch at Ten Minutes past Three of the Clock and reassembled at Forty Minutes past Three of the Clock.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 22. There is an amendment to be moved by Sri Imam.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Sir, I beg to move my amendment to Clause 22 which runs as follows :

> " That sub-clause (3) of Clause 22 be so amended as to provide for the increase in the total number of seats in the Legislative Council of Mysore from 40 to 41, one seat being allotted to the Bellary District Local Authorities ".

Sir, my friends Sri Pattabhiraman and Sri M. V. Rama Rao have ably placed before this House the disadvantages created by the adoption of this clause, clause 22, sub-clause (3), and they have also said that these areas go unrepresented. I move this amendment with a view to see that these unrepresented areas do not go unrepresented and that one seat should be allotted to the district of Bellary. It was pointed out by the Chief Minister that Sections 171 and 172 of the Constitution are against this. He says that there is no provision to raise the number from forty to forty-one. I am not much of a lawyer. I consulted some of my friends. They seem to agree with the

(Sri J. Mohamed Imam.)

interpretation of the Chief Minister. Personally I feel that there is room to enhance the number from forty to forty-one because the first section lays down that the number for the Legislative Council should not exceed one-fourth of the number of the Legislative Assembly members. But when an exemption is given and provision is made by the subsequent clause that the number of the members of the Legislative Council shall not be less than forty, in my opinion, the number should not be less than forty, but there is room to increase the number and there is no objection to have the number by more than forty. We can increase the number. Once when we are under the exemption clause, there is room to increase the number to more than forty. They have fixed only the minimum and not the maximum. This may be examined by legal experts and if it is possible to increase the number by one, this may be done.

Apart from this, they must judge the case on equitable grounds. One ground for an additional seat has been urged very ably by my friends and that is, no area should go unrepresented. If it goes unrepresented it is against the principle of democracy. They want to club together the two districts of Chitaldrug and Bellary. If the number is not increased, the representation from both the districts will be only one. The Bellary constitution is much bigger, twice as big as any other constituency within the State of Mysore. It will be very unjust to the representatives of these two districts. Chitaldrug alone has one representative elected by that constituency. Now they want two districts to elect one member. It is quite necessary to give one more representative to the district of Bellary. If this principle is recognised, I submit that the Constitution itself must be amended. If the present provision made is against the principle to increase the number, then, it is left to the Parliament to amend the Constitution and see that necessary provision is made and another extra seat given to the district of Bellary. Perhaps the framers of these laws did not know the actual local conditions and what a huge constituency it would be if both these districts amalgamated. It will be an unjust measure to both these districts. Taking into consideration the size and population of other districts, the area will be twice and the population also twice as much as in any other similar constituency. There is every reason why Parliament should amend the Constitution and make the necessary provision. I think clubbing together of Bellary and Chitaldrug has been done out of ignorance. I must agree with Mr. Pattabhiraman that if the Capital of India had been nearer to Mysore, they would have realised the local difficulties. I agree with him that the Capital of India should be somewhere near Hyderabad or in Hyderabad itself so that all people may have access to it. Delhi is so far; the distance between South India and Delhi is more than 1,500 miles. That is also one of the reasons why people living in South India are neglected. Their wants are not properly attended to. I also support Sri Pattabhiraman that the Government of India should seriously think that, in the interests of the country with a view to satisfy all sections, of changing the Capital to a central place in India and perhaps that place would be Hyderabad.

Why I said is this : somebody drafts the Constitution in Delhi without knowing the actual conditions existing in these two districts. If they are somewhere in a central region, they will be in a position to know the actual conditions prevailing throughout India and it will also be very convenient to every citizen of India to go to the Indian Capital and take advantage of its nearness. Otherwise, as it is, people living in the South are at a great disadvantage and people living in the North are much better off and it is common complaint that those who are near the Capital reap all the

advantages and those who are far off are being neglected. So, Sir, on these grounds, I submit that this amendment may be accepted. Now for the present, I suggest that this clause which empowers for the inclusion of Bellary in Chitaldrug Constituency may be omitted and if it is deleted and if we send the Bill after deleting it, then the Government will open their eyes and make suitable provision . . . ."

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Their eyes are always open.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I said just now that their eyes are not open. We are very far a way from the Capital of India. I commend this, Sir, for the acceptance of the House.

Sri R. ANANTARAMAN (Chamarajpet).—I wish to point one more constitutional difficulty, if it is not amended. According to clause (3) the sitting members of the Legislative Council of Mysore representing the Chitaldrug Local Authorities Constituency are sitting in the Upper House. Next year as you all know three members will retire. Who are going to elect them? Will it be only Chitaldrug District people or Bellary people?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಹನುಮಂತಯ್ಯ —ಅದಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲಾ ಪ್ರೊವೈಡ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA (Channagiri).—Chitaldrug *cum* Bellary.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Member may please see the Fifth Schedule.

Sri R. ANANTARAMAN.—Another thing is, representatives of the people of Chitaldrug cannot effectively represent the Local Authorities of Bellary. Of course, when they cannot effectively represent them, how can they say that they are elected from Bellary District also? I think it is such a simple amendment that the Leader of the House may kindly accept.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—So far as the Legislative Council Members from Bellary District are concerned, I am in full sympathy with Sri J. Mohamed Imam. The reason is that a member who was elected from there should have had the equal right of joining this House just as the other members who are elected from the other parts of Andhra Area or to have the benefit of the membership in the other House which has to be formed. But there is the constitutional difficulty. This is a contingency which perhaps when framing the Constitution was not contemplated. Now that there is this contingency that a member who has been elected from an area which has been integrated with Mysore will lose the benefit of being a member of this House, it is possible for the Centre to consider this question. As at present, there is an article of the Constitution which says there shall not be members exceeding one-fourth in the Lower House. Now we are getting 5 to 6 members from the Legislative Assembly of Madras to Mysore. So, there is that Constitutional difficulty. But it is possible that the Government of India might think of amending the Constitution because they have got a right to do so at any time. In order to provide for such contingencies, there is a possibility of adding one more member for every such four members in the Lower House. If by some amendment the Government of India could think of adding such a provision, it would be very convenient. Therefore, from that point of view, I appeal to the Government of Mysore to correspond with and see that this number is added on to that constituency and suitable provision is made. The second point which is most important is about the constituency. For a teacher or a graduate to contact 14 lakhs of people is not contemplated anywhere in Mysore State and therefore, the delimitation of constituencies must either be suitably amended or provision is made for that district also to send up one representative. Even from that point of view, the provision relating to the Legislative Council will have to be changed in order to see that the constituencies are almost equal. One cannot comprehend the

(SRI A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.)

meaning of one constituency within a limit of 7 lakhs and another constituency with double that number. So, under these circumstances, I appeal to the Government of Mysore, though at present they cannot accept this amendment, they will have to correspond with and see that the Central Government makes necessary amendment so as to correct these three anomalies.

Sri MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.—I am in complete agreement with Sri Pattabhiraman when he said that this provision should not have been included in this Bill, especially in view of what has been stated in clause (3), that is:

> "The sitting members of the Legislative Council of Mysore representing the Chitaldrug (Local Authorities) Constituency shall, as from the appointed day, be deemed to have been elected to that Council by the Chitaldrug *cum* Bellary (Local Authorities) constituency."

and also what has been stated in subsequent clause (4). As he himself suggested already, those people should go without a constituency. Regarding the Local Authorities Constituency from Bellary, there will be no representative from Bellary District as such. There was a representative to the Legislative Council of Madras from three Districts. So, that question does not arise. The other point I would like to stress regarding Teachers and Graduates' Constituencies is this. When elections take place after the first rotation, there may not be much difficulty. But regarding Chitaldrug *cum* Bellary Local Authorities' Constituency, at present, Chitaldrug has a population of 8,80,000 and to add another 7,70,000 to it, I am afraid, will be a very heavy burden and to give two representatives for those 17 lakhs of people is not proper and is not in proportion to what is being done in other constituencies. So, I suggest that, if it is not possible to increase the number from 40 to any other number by amending the Constitution itself, at least the delimitation of Local Authorities' Constituencies should take place and I feel that it is a necessary thing to be done. Otherwise, Chitaldrug which has got the right to send two representatives will have to forego that right. So, Sir, though I am supporting the amendment moved by Sri Mahomed Imam in this respect, the Government should see that, if possible, this constitutional provision is amended. Otherwise, the delimitation of Local Authorities' Constituencies should take place afresh.

4 P.M.

*Sri M. LINGANNA.—Sir, I wish to draw the attention of this House to clause 23. It reads like this:

> "23. *Electoral rolls for modified Council Constituencies.*—As soon as may be after the appointed day, the electoral rolls for the Mysore (Graduates) Constituency and the Mysore (Teachers) Constituency shall be revised and an electoral roll shall be prepared for the Chitaldrug *cum* Bellary (Local Authorities) Constituency of the Mysore Legislative Council in accordance with the provisions of the Representation of the People Act (XLIII of 1950), and the rolls so revised or prepared shall come into force immediately upon their final publication in accordance with the rules made under that Act."

Sir, of course, my learned friends were of the opinion that the transferred territory of Bellary should not go unrepresented. We know so far as the Local Authorities' Constituency is concerned, one seat is vacant for the Legislative Council. This particular provision, in a way, aids the people from the transferred territory to get a representative elected, though

*Asterisk indicates that the speech has not been revised by the Member concerned.

their chance may be very little. If we take the population of Chitaldrug and the population of Bellary Taluk, they may not be able to get a seat that is vacant at present. In order to overcome the constitutional difficulty, I think, this section 23 may be taken, no doubt. That apart, the Central Government should have said that this particular part would go for a certain period without representation. It is pointed out that the area would be so large that it would not at all be possible to have a representative from the Graduates' Constituency or Local Authorities' Constituency and as the population is bulky, it is not desirable to have such a big constituency for Teachers' Constituency or Local Authorities' Constituency. I submit that these provisions 22 (3) and (4) should be amended. I submit that Government of Mysore should make this specific representation to Central Government that, if necessary, this particular article that stands in the way........

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Of the Constitution?

Sri M. LINGANNA.—Yes. There was certain decision by the High Court of Madras with regard to the communal G. O. and the Central Government was moved. Here, we are hundred representatives and we are more than a High Court. So, if necessary, if they want to give proper representation to the transferred territory, they should amend this. Because the Parliament would be sitting from the 3rd of next month, it would not be very difficult for them to do this if they really meant to give proper representation to the transferred territory which is going to be added to Mysore State. From this point of view, though indirect representation is sought to be given to the Bellary District as per section 23, I feel full justice will not be done by this. Therefore, the concerned section should be amended. I support the amendment.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I have already answered the point raised. My friend, Sri Imam will kindly see the constitutional difficulty. It is not as if it is so easy a matter to amend Article 171. A constitutional amendment will have to go through the formalities prescribed in the Constitution, and it may not be easily done. Even if a constitutional amendment has to be effected, there must be some reason. Here, in this case, there is no reason whatever, because, if the minimum is to be increased, it has to be increased not merely to Mysore but also to Madhya Pradesh and other concerned States. Therefore, its operation is going to affect not only Mysore State but also all other States. No other State has made a request for a constitutional amendment of this nature. Therefore, merely to suit our convenience it would be very difficult to persuade the Parliament to introduce an amendment to this effect. What has to be done is, as Sri Bheemappa Naik suggested, we have to get the People's Representation Act amended suitably so that there may be fresh delimitation of constituencies so far as Mysore State is concerned with regard to Legislative Council. That representation, I will make at the proper time.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I seek the leave of the House to withdraw my amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That clause 22 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clauses 23 to 37. There are no amendments. The question is:

"That clauses 23 to 37, both inclusive, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 38. There is an amendment in the name of Sri M. V. Rama Rao.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I will examine the legal position. So, we shall take up clauses relating to the High Court tomorrow. The rest of the clauses may be proceeded with. I hope my Hon'ble friend will agree to that.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—I would suggest that clause 38, 41, and 50 to 55 may go together. I have tabled amendments for those clauses also and so they may perhaps be taken up together. With respect to the postponement of consideration of clause 38, I have really no objection at all. But, I suggest that while we postpone the consideration of this clause, we do not preclude ourselves from examining any relevant provision and discussion may not be set off by the reason that we have passed over this clause. Therefore, I suggest that we may deal with the other provisions, for instance, the Seventh Schedule which, I suppose, would occupy a considerable time and it would not be in reference with the the other clauses.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We will have to take up clause 56.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—My amendment is this. I move :

> "That the words 'for a period of two years from the appointed day' occurring in sub-clause (1) shall be omitted ; the full stop at the end of the sub-clause shall be replaced by a comma, and the following words added thereafter :—
>
> 'for such period, not exceeding two years, and upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon between the Governments concerned by the 1st day of January 1954 or, if no agreement is reached by the said date, as may be fixed by order of the President'."

Sir, this clause and the amendment are self-explanatory. The clause refers to detention in and power to commit to certain jails and other institutions. The amendment envisages an agreement with the concerned States. In case there is no agreement, the President will be called upon to give a decision. Matters that will come up for discussion under these clauses would be the number of prisoners to be retained, the share of expenses and the period within which these things have to come to an end. Therefore, I commend my amendment for the acceptance of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

> "That the words 'for a period of two years from the appointed day' occurring in sub-clause (1) shall be omitted ; the full stop at the end of the sub-clause shall be replaced by a comma, and the following words added thereafter :—
>
> 'for such period, not exceeding two years, and upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon between the Governments concerned by the 1st day of January 1954 or, if no agreement is reached by the said date, as may be fixed by order of the President'."

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I seek one information, Sir. There are now four jails there and if we commit ourselves to the agreement, will that in any way commit us that we should continue all the four jails or can we make such internal arrangements as we deem it fit ?

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—I am glad you asked for clarification. When we go into a conference with the concerned Government for an agreement, we will certainly see what is right and proper for us to do and whether it is in reference to period or the amount of expense to be shared and things like that, all will have to be discussed and decided. By passing this amendment, there is no committal on our part. In the agreement we may say : "we are not prepared to maintain any prisoners and straightaway you can take them away to your

prisons". It is merely a procedure laid down for the settlement of the problem.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

> "That the words 'for a period of two years from the appointed day' occurring in sub-clause (1) shall be omitted; the full stop at the end of the sub-clause shall be replaced by a comma, and the following words added thereafter:—
>
> 'for such period, not exceeding two years, and upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon between the Governments concerned by the 1st day of January 1954 or, if no agreement is reached by the said date, as may be fixed by order of the President'."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The amendment is passed.

Sri S. R. NAGAPPA SETTY (Shimoga).—I beg to move:

> "That Clause 57 be so amended as to delete" ....

Mr. SPEAKER.—In clause 57 the words 'Government of Mysore' are found and not 'Government of India'. Even in clause 56 there are the words 'Government of Mysore'.

Sri S. R. NAGAPPA SETTY.—My amendment then refers to clause 56. I had written correctly. It is a printing mistake. I may be permitted to move the amendment.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, there is a printing mistake. Instead of being printed as 56, it is printed as 57.

Sri S. R. NAGAPPA SETTY.—I move:

> "That clause 56 be so amended as to delete the words 'the Government of Mysore' in sub-clause (1)".

ಆಂಧ್ರಪ್ರಾಂತ ಬೇರೆಯಾಗಿ, ಮದ್ರಾಸ್ ಪ್ರಾಂತವೇ ಬೇರೆಯಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣವಾಗುವ ಆಂಧ್ರಪ್ರಾಂತದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಖೈದಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ಜೈಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ clause ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಕಾರಣಾಂತರಗಳಿಂದ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಒಳಜಗಳಗಳು ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ಆ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಬಹಳ ಮಂದಿ ಖೈದಿಗಳಾಗಿ ಬಂದರೆ, ಮೈಸೂರು ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರುವ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟದೇ ಆದರೆ, ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಶಾಂತಿಗೆ ಭಂಗಬರಬಹುದು. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಖೈದಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮದ್ರಾಸ್ ಪ್ರಾಂತದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದರಿಂದ ಯಾವ ತೊಂದರೆಯೂ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಾಂತದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಆಂಧ್ರ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಜನರ ಪ್ರಭಾವ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿದ್ದು ನಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಾಂತದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಶಾಂತಿವಾತಾವರಣ ಕಲಕಬಹುದು. ಈ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿರುವ "Government of Mysore" ಎಂಬ ಪದಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಲು ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೋರುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—Sir, on a point of order as well as on point of information. The words 'Government of India' do not occur in clause 57 or clause 56.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is a printing mistake, as I already said. Instead of saying 'Government of Mysore', he has put in the amendment the words 'the Government of India'. That may kindly be corrected.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—Are you thinking of clause 57?

Mr. SPEAKER.—No. Clause 56.

Sri M. LINGANNA.—May I know the number of prisoners there?

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—I will give you the information presently.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

> "That clause 56 be so amended as to delete the words 'the Government of Mysore' in sub-clause (1)".

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಹನುಮಂತಯ್ಯ —ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ನಾಗಪ್ಪಶೆಟ್ಟಿಯವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ವಾದ ಬಹಳ ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೂ ಕೂಡ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಒಂದು ಮಾರ್ಗವನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ದಾರಿ ಇದೆ. ಈ ದಿನ ಮೈಸೂರುದೇಶದ ಮೇಲಿನ ಅಭಿಮಾನಪೂರ್ವಕವಾದ ಒಂದು ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ಡಿಟೆನ್ಯೂ ಸಹ ಇಲ್ಲ. There is no detenue in Mysore State. I think for the last several years this is to the credit of the Mysore State. ಈ ದಿನ ಆಂಧ್ರ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಡಿಟೆನ್ಯೂಗಳನ್ನು ಅಥವಾ ತಮಿಳುನಾಡಿನ ಡಿಟೆನ್ಯೂಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಇಲ್ಲಿನ ಮಧುರ ವಾತಾವರಣವನ್ನು ಏತ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಹನುಮಂತಯ್ಯ.)

ಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಕಲಕಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಉದ್ಭವವಾಗತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಯಾವ Government ಇದೆಯೋ ಅವರೊಡನೆ ಯಾವಯಾವ ಖೈದಿಗಳನ್ನು ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ಜೈಲಿನಲ್ಲಿಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಒಪ್ಪಂದ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವಾಗ ಡೆಟಿನ್ಯೂಗಳು ಮಾತ್ರ ಬೇಡವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಲು ನಮಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಅವರು ಡೆಟಿನ್ಯೂಗಳನ್ನು ಬೇರೆ ಕಡೆ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು ; ಇತರ ಖೈದಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಬಹುದು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಅನುಮಾನವಿದೆಯೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಪರಿಹಾರಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಸೂಕ್ತವಾದ ಮಾರ್ಗ ಈ clauseನ ಮೂಲಕ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

ಎರಡನೆಯ ವಿಷಯ: ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ಟೌನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂರು ಜೈಲುಗಳಿವೆ. ಆ ಜೈಲಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವವರೆಲ್ಲರನ್ನೂ ಆಂಧ್ರ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದವರು ಅಕ್ಟೋಬರ್ ಎರಡನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖಿನ ದಿನ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡುಹೋಗಿ ಬೇರೆ ಇಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಜೈಲು ಕಟ್ಟಡವಿಲ್ಲ. ಜಸ್ಟಿಸ್ ಮಿಶ್ರಾರವರು ಬಂದು ಈ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರಿಸಿದಾಗ ಅವರು ಒಂದು ಸಮರಸವಾದ ಉತ್ತರವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರು. ನಮಗೆ ಕಟ್ಟಡಗಳಿಲ್ಲ, ಆಫೀಸುಗಳಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಜೈಲುಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೇರೆ ಕಟ್ಟಡವನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವವರೆಗೆ ನಮಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಆಂಧ್ರರು ಕೇಳುವಾಗ ಅವರಿಗೆ ನಾವು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೂ ಈ ದಿನ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಯಾವ ಕಟ್ಟಡವನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ಇತರರು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಒಂದು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೂ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೂ ಸೌಹಾರ್ದ ಮತ್ತು ಸಹಕಾರ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಆಂಧ್ರ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವೆಂದು ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಒಪ್ಪಿದಮೇಲೆ ಜಸ್ಟಿಸ್ ಮಿಶ್ರಾರವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಅವಾರ್ಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಅಂಶವನ್ನೂ ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈ ಒಂದು ಸೌಹಾರ್ದಯುತವಾದ ಮತ್ತು ಸಹಕಾರಯುತವಾದ ವರ್ತನೆಗೆ ಅನುಸಾರವಾಗಿ ಈ clause ಇದೆ.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH (Koratagere—Madhugiri-- Scheduled Castes).—Is this only a temporary arrangement ?

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Yes.

Sri S. R. NAGAPPA SETTY.—I seek the leave of the House to withdraw my amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That clause 56, as amended, stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, I promised to give some figures. Here they are.

Central Jail—840.
Alipore Jail—1,101.
Junior Certified School—280.
Borstal School—350.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause Amendment by No. 57 Sri Nagappa Setty.

Sri S. R. NAGAPPA SETTY.—I am not moving the amendment, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That clauses 57 to 61, both inclusive, stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 62. The question is :

"That clause 62 stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now clause 62A. There are certain amendments.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Sir, before moving the amendments to clause 62-A, it will help us greatly if the Minister for Public Works will kindly make a statement regarding the nature of the talks he had at Delhi and whether he wants us to accept this clause or whether any changes are to be made.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ (ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂ ಮತ್ತು ಮರಾಮತ್ತು ಶಾಖೆಗಳ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ತುಂಗಭದ್ರಾ ಪ್ರಾಜೆಕ್ಟ್ ಸಂಬಂಧವಾಗಿ ದೆಹಲಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ಸಮ್ಮೇಳನಗಳು ನಡೆದವು. ಆ ಸಮ್ಮೇಳನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೈದರಾಬಾದು, ಮದರಾಸು ಮತ್ತು ಮೈಸೂರು ಈ ಮೂರು ಸರ್ಕಾರಗಳ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳೂ ಬಾಗವಹಿಸಿದ್ದರು. ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಆ ಸಮ್ಮೇಳನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಬಂದ ವಿಷಯ ಎಂದರೆ ಈ ಪ್ರಾಜೆಕ್ಟನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸುವ ವಿಚಾರ. ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಸುಮಾರು 15 ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಖರ್ಚಾಗಿವೆ. ಇನ್ನೂ ಕೆಲಸ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕಾದದ್ದು ಇದೆ. ಈ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಯಾರು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹಳವಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆದು ಕೊನೆಗೆ ಈ ನೀರಾವರಿ ಯೋಜನೆ ಸಂಬಂಧವಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದದ್ದರಿಂದ ಆ ತೀರ್ಮಾನದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಗಳ ಚೀಫ್ ಎಂಜನಿಯರುಗಳನ್ನೊಳಗೊಂಡ ಒಂದು ಸಮಿತಿ ಅಥವಾ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂತಲೂ, ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ನೇಮಕಮಾಡಲ್ಪಟ್ಟ ಒಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಆ ಸಮಿತಿಯ

ಚೇರ್ಮನ್ ಆಗಿರಬೇಕೆಂತಲೂ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಯಿತು. ಇನ್ನು ವಿದ್ಯುಚ್ಛಕ್ತಿ ಯೋಜನೆಯ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೂ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮತ್ತು ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲೂ ಸಹ ಯಾವ ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೂ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾರು ಈ ಪ್ರಾಜೆಕ್ಟನ್ನು ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂಬ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಯಾವ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವೂ ಆಗಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವುಗಳೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ಪುನಃ ಒಪ್ಪಂದದ ಮೂಲಕ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಮಹಮ್ಮದ್ ಇಮಾಂ.—ಕೆಲವು ಸಂಶಯಗಳಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ತುಂಗಭದ್ರಾ ಪ್ರಾಜೆಕ್ಟಿನ ಮೇಲೆ 15 ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ವೆಚ್ಚವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟು ಅಂಶ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಯಾವ ಯಾವುವೆಂದರೆ:

Will it add any fresh liability to the State of Mysore and are we expected to pay any contribution out of the amount that has already been spent ? That is point No. 1. Then what is the agreement arrived at to meet further commitments regarding the remaining work that has to be executed or the completion of the Dam and also undertaking the execution of the high level canal which may cost, I think, another 15 crores ? So, what are the proposals of the Government of Mysore and other Governments for meeting these extra commitments? When will the work relating to the high level canal begin and what are the steps taken by the respective Governments, because I know it will be a joint venture of the Mysore Government and the Andhra State ? What are the steps taken by these two Governments to fiind the extra money which is a huge sum for the completion of the entire project ? And thirdly Sir, who is responsible to take necessary steps for the maintenance of the health in this area ? As you know, Sir, nearly three or four taluks will be affected on account of the huge stretch of water in this area. Thungabhadra Dam covers an area of 133 miles and naturally this water affects the people of all the adjoining area and their health and climatic conditions will considerably deteriorate. In the *atchkat* area or the area served by the canal, we have got to look after the health and take necessary measures for the prevention of epidemics. Who is responsible for this ? Is it only the Government of Mysore or will it be the joint concern of the Mysore and Andhra States ? And fourthly, protective works behind the Dam. Who will be responsible for this, because I think the interest of the Andhra State commences beyond 100 miles ? They will look to their own distributories. I want the Government to study these four points. First of all, what would be our share of liability on the amount that has been spent by the Government of Madras ? Secondly, for the completion of the project including the completion of the canal, high level canal and the remaining works will have to be done by the Government and what is the share of the Andhra State ? Thirdly, another important point is that Government of Mysore should make necessary agreement regarding the apportionment of water between Mysore and Andhra. There has been an agreement between Mysore and Madras so far as the apportionment of water between Lakkavalli Reservior and Tunga is concerned. Now the question arises, between Mysore and Andhra. Regarding these points, the Government must be very vigilant and very careful. There is bound to be an agreement in regard to the sharing of waters allotted to Mysore and Andhra and the future maintenance. On this also, the Government has to take necessary care and find out what is the share of water allotted to Mysore and what is allotted to Andhra. On these various points, if you have got any understanding or agreement, the Minister may kindly let us know. Otherwise, I request to bear all these points in mind at the time of negotiations.

4-30 P.M.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA (Channagiri).—If the Hon'ble Member feels that by a public discussion of the matter, negotiations are going to be prejudiced...

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—No. On the other hand, I might straightaway say that the opinion

(SRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA.)

expressed on the floor of this House will be greatly helpful to Mysore Government so far as further negotiations are concerned. I request you to kindly allow some discussion on this subject so that Government may be fully armed with the views of members and we may act accordingly at the conferences to be convened for these purposes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I very well remember that, when a question relating to this was taken up and a series of supplementaries were put, the Hon'ble the Chief Minister or the concerned Minister—I forget who it is—.................

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—It is the Home Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER.— . . . said that he would consult some members of this House. The ex-Ministers who held the portfolio of the Public Works Department—excluding me many of you are there—and some more members may be consulted. That is what the Minister said. That would be desirable.

Sri M. LINGANNA.—It is with reference to a suggestion made by Sri L. Siddappa to appoint a Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER.—A Committee is not necessary, but some of the members may be consulted

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—In fact, even now, after the discussion on the floor of this House takes place, I will consult some of the members, as I have already promised on the floor of this House. I will keep in touch with the opinions of those members from time to time during the course of the negotiations. That apart, I would welcome the opinions of all those who feel like speaking on the subject ; that would greatly help the Government.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—With your permission I may be permitted to offer some remarks about this matter. I seek your permission to sit and speak.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಲ್. ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ತುಂಗಭದ್ರಾ ಯೋಜನೆಗೆ ಖರ್ಚಾಗಿರುವ ಮೊಬಲಗನ್ನು ಹಂಚುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ತಾವು ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಒಂದನೆಯದು, ಪ್ರಾಯಶಃ ಇದು ರೆಸಿಡ್ಯುಯರಿ ಮದ್ರಾಸ್ ಸ್ಟೇಟಿಗೆ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದು ಹಾಗೆ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸದೆ ಇದ್ದರೂ ಅದನ್ನೂ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು; ಏಕೆಂದರೆ, ಮದ್ರಾಸ್ ಸ್ಟೇಟಿನವರ ಇರಿಗೇಷನ್ ಪ್ರಾಜೆಕ್ಟುಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದು ಸಾಲ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡ ಮೊಬಲಗಿನಿಂದಲೇ ಅಲ್ಲ. ಅವರಿಗೂ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ರಿಸರ್ವ್ ಫಂಡುಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಸರ್‌ಪ್ಲಸ್ಸುಗಳು ಇದ್ದುವು. ರಿಸರ್ವ್ ಫಂಡಿನಿಂದ ಹಾಗೂ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಸರ್ಪ್ಲಸ್‌ನಿಂದ ಎಷ್ಟು ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೊ, ಆ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿರುವುದರ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನ ಮದ್ರಾಸ್ ಆಧಿಪತ್ಯಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲಾ ಬರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ರೆಸಿಡ್ಯುಯರಿ ಮದ್ರಾಸಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು apportion ಆಗಬೇಕು, ಹೊಸ ಆಂಧ್ರ ಪ್ರಾಂತಕ್ಕೆ ಎಷ್ಟು apportion ಆಗಬೇಕು ಮತ್ತು ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಸೇರತಕ್ಕ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ಭಾಗಕ್ಕೆ ಎಷ್ಟು apportion ಆಗಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ. ಎರಡನೆಯದಾಗಿ, ಇದಲ್ಲದೆ ಸಾಲ ಎತ್ತಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮೊಬಲಗನ್ನು ಈ ಯೋಜನೆಗಾಗಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂಬುದನ್ನೂ ಪರ್ಯಾಲೋಚನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು.

ಆಮೇಲೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಇಮಾಂರವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ, ತುಂಗಭದ್ರಾ ರಿಸರ್ವಾಯರ್ ಇರುವ ಭಾಗವಾದ 133 ಚದರ ಮೈಲಿ ಪ್ರದೇಶ ಮೈಸೂರು ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಮಲೇರಿಯಾ ಕಂಟ್ರೋಲ್ ವಗೈರೆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾವು ಏನು ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಆ ಖರ್ಚನ್ನು ನಾವು ನಿಗದಿಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಬರೀ ತುಂಗಭದ್ರೆಯಿಂದ ನೀರಾವರಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲೇ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಈ 133 ಚದರ ಮೈಲಿ ಪ್ರದೇಶದ ಸುತ್ತಮುತ್ತಲಿನ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಕೆಲವು ಮುಂಜಾಗ್ರತೆ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಮಲೇರಿಯಾ ನಿವಾರಣೆಗಾಗಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದರ ಹಿಂಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊಸಪೇಟೆಯ ಕೆಲವು ಪ್ರದೇಶ, ಹರಪನಹಳ್ಳಿ ಮತ್ತು ಕೂಡ್ಲಿಗಿಯ ಕೆಲವು ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳು ಬರುತ್ತವೆ. ಆ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಾ anti-malarial measures ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. Protective works ಮಾಡುವುದಲ್ಲದೆ ಪ್ರತಿವರ್ಷವೂ maintenanceಗೆ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ಖರ್ಚು ವಹಿಸುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಸೇರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ನಾವು ಅಷ್ಟು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಆಂಧ್ರ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಭಾಗ ನೀರಾವರಿಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕಂತೆ ಅವರೂ ಕೂಡ ಆ ಖರ್ಚನ್ನು ವಹಿಸಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಅವರೊಡನೆ ಸಮಾಲೋಚನೆ ನಡೆಸಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Future maintenance and anti-malarial measures ಇವು ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಿಷಯಗಳು. ಕೃಷ್ಣರಾಜಸಾಗರಕ್ಕೆ 40 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಮೂರರಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರದೇಶ ಅಲ್ಲಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಬಹಳ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ಖರ್ಚನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ಹೊಸ ಆಂಧ್ರರಾಜ್ಯ ವಹಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಎಷ್ಟು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎಂದರೆ ಆ ಜಲಾಶಯದ ನೀರಿನಿಂದ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಪ್ರದೇಶ ನೀರಾವರಿಯಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅದರ ಹಿಂದಿನ ಮತ್ತು ಸುತ್ತ

ಮುಂದಿನ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ನೋಡಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕಂತೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಅದರ ಖರ್ಚನ್ನು ನಾವು apportion ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಮದರಾಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ Reservesನಿಂದ ಎಷ್ಟು, ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಸರ್‌ಪ್ಲಸ್‌ನಿಂದ ಎಷ್ಟು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಎಷ್ಟು ಸಾಲವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಗಮನಿಸಿ, ಸಾಲ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಮಾಡಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ apportion ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಯೆ ಅಥವಾ ಪ್ರದೇಶದ ವಿಸ್ತೀರ್ಣದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಯೆ ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟು, ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಬೇಕ .

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Sir, I have another suggestion to make. While considering the liabilities, it is not merely the amount that has been spent out of Reserves which should be taken into consideration. I entirely agree with the suggestion of Sri Siddappa. While apportioning liabilities, we should take into consideration not merely the amount spent on the Tungabhadra project, but also similar works in Madras for the last two or three decades. There is the Mettur Dam upon which ten to fifteen crores of rupees have been spent. The amount spent on Mettur Dam came from the entire Madras State, including the District of Bellary and the other districts that go to form Andhra. There is the Pykara Project. For all these projects, the entire State has financed. While apportioning the liabilities, the amount spent on these two should also be taken into consideration. Whatever amount is debited to Mysore, it should be done after excluding the amounts proportionately incurred as expenditure on these works. All these things must be taken into consideration. The amount spent on Andhra Districts and Bellary District must be taken into consideration and the share of the expenditure on Thungabhadra must be determined in the light of the amount we have already spent on the other works.

Regarding the management, Sir, it is proposed to have a Joint Board, the Revenue Minister said that there is the possibility of appointing a Board of three Chief Engineers ......

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—That is for the execution of the balance of the work and not for the management.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Of course, Hyderabad has got half share and it has to be there. I have no objection for the Government of Andhra sending their Chief Engineer and Mysore also having their Chief Engineer. But personally, the actual execution and management and direction of the work, I think, must be vested in the Government of Mysore. You can have a Committee but for the reason that the dam is situated in the State of Mysore, it is always good to have one agency instead of having dual control. The third reason is, we may continue the same Engineering establishment if they care to remain there; otherwise, we have got sufficient trained personnel to look after the work and we have got competent persons to look after the work and if further execution of the work is entrusted to the Government of Mysore, then it will be a step in the right direction and it will be in the proper and quick execution of the work of Thungabhadra. Of course, I do not mean to say that Andhra State should not have its representative; it will have its representative in the Committee and they will send their Chief Engineer to give us their suggestion. But with regard to the actual work and to taking necessary health measures and anti-malarial measures, all these things should be vested with the Government of Mysore. Now, regarding future liabilities, we need another Rs. 15 crores and it is in the interest of the Mysore State that this high level canal must be undertaken as early as possible because without the high level canal, the State of Mysore will not be much benefited. If we finish the high level canal, it will help nearly 200,000 acres. Without that, it will be limited to 90,000 acres. So, without that, we do not get adequate amount spent. It is therefore quite necessary that the high level canal

(Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.)

should be taken up immediately in the interest of Mysore. The question arises as to where to find the funds for the execution of this high level canal; up to our border, it will be the entire responsibility of the State of Mysore and beyond their borders, it will be the responsibility of the Andhras. If I understand correctly, it is about 120 miles. The entire cost must be borne by the Government of Mysore. It is a serious matter for us how to implement this work and what are the means of finding out the amount; if the Government have any proposal, we will be glad to know it. Otherwise, on whom shall this liability devolve; it is a ticklish question, and I leave it to the Revenue Minister to answer this question.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Why do you presume that the Hon'ble the Chief Minister does not know this point?

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—That is a difficult problem. I do not want to embarrass them by giving any suggestion. It is a serious matter which has to be considered. These are the suggestions for the present which I am making.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ತುಂಗ ಭದ್ರ ಯೋಜನೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಣೆಕಟ್ಟು ನಿರ್ಮಾಣದ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಈಗಾಗಲೆ ಅನೇಕ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಪುಷ್ಟೀಕರಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಒಂದೆರಡು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರಿಗೆ ವಿವರಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದ್ದ ಹಾಗೆ ಇರುವ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಮುಳುಗಡೆಯಾಗಿ ರತಕ್ಯಂಥ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಸವಾಗಿದ್ದ ಜನರ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ. ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಹಾಗೆ ನಾನು ಕಳೆದ ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಹಿಂದೆ ಆ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದಾಗ ನಾರಾಯಣದೇವರಕೆರೆ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಳುಗಡೆಯಾಗಿರುವ ಪ್ರದೇಶದ ಸಂತಪ್ತರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಿ, ಮದ್ರಾಸು ಮತ್ತು ಹೈದರಾಬಾದು ಸರ್ಕಾರಗಳಿಗೆ ಮನವಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದುದು ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಡಾ॥ ಲೋಹಿಯಾರವರೂ ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದರು. ಈಗ ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಪೂರ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ಇತ್ಯರ್ಥವಾಗಿದ್ದರೂ, ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಳುಗಡೆಯಾಗಿರುವ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಸಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಪುನರ್ನಿವೇಶನಕ್ಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ಪುನರ್ವಸತಿಗೆ ಸಹ ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೆ ಎಂಬುದು ಇನ್ನೂ ಖಚಿತವಾಗಿ ನಿರ್ಧಾರವಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಯುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ಕೂಡ ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಅಜಿಟೇಷನ್ ನಡೆದಿದೆಯೆಂದು ನನಗೆ ಕಂಡುಬಂದಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಪ್ರಾಂತದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹಳ ಮಂದಿಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಆ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದವರ ಮನೆಮಠಗಳು, ಆಸ್ತಿಪಾಸ್ತಿಗಳು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಮುಳುಗಿಹೋಗಿವೆ. ಕಾನೂನು ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಏನು ಪರಿಹಾರಕೊಡಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಬಡವರಿಗೆ ಏನೂ ಆಸ್ತಿಪಾಸ್ತಿಯಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಯಾರು ಬೇರೆಯವರ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಕೃಷಿಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ರೈತರಾಗಿದ್ದರೋ ಅವರಿಗೆ, ಯಾವುದೇ ವಿಧವಾದ ಪರಿಹಾರ ಕೂಡ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಂಥ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹುಶಃ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಈ ನೀತಿಯನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಈಗ ತುಂಗಾ ಅಣೆಕಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಳುಗಡೆ ಆಗಿರುವ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ತರಹ ಪರಿಹಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟರು? ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಒಂದು ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗೆ ಯಾವರೀತಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಆಂಟಿ ಮಲೇರಿಯಾ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು, ಮತ್ತು ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುವ ಹಣ ಕೂಡ ಲೆಕ್ಕಹಾಕಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೋ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಈ ಸಂತಪ್ತರಿಗೆ, ಮುಳುಗಡೆಯಾಗಿರುವ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಸಂತಪ್ತರಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಪುನರ್ನಿವೇಶನ, ಪುನರ್ವಸತಿ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶ, ಪ್ರಾವಿಷನ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ವಿನಂತಿಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಷಯ. ಈ ಯೋಜನೆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನೀರು ಒದಗಿಸುವುದು ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಕೆಲವು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ. ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಭಾಗ ಅನಂತಪುರ, ಕಡಪ ಮತ್ತು ಕರ್ನೂಲು ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟುಗಳಿಗೆ ನೀರು ಸರಬರಾಯಿ ಈ ಯೋಜನೆಯಿಂದ ಆಗುವುದು. ಆ ಕಡೆಯಲ್ಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಮೈಸೂರು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಒಂದು ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ, ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೂ ಈ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ನೆರವಿಗೆ ಬಂದು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾದ ಹಣದ ಹೊರೆಯನ್ನು ಹೊರಬೇಕಾದದ್ದು ಯೋಗ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಕೂಡ ನಾನು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ, ಈ ಕ್ಷಣದವರೆಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಕೇಂದ್ರದವರು ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಹಾಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಯೋಜನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯಗತ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ, ನೀರಾವರಿ ಯೋಜನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯಗತ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವ ಹಣವನ್ನೂ ಒದಗಿಸಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಯೋಜನೆಯನ್ನು ನಾವು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವಾಗ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಒಂದು ಹಣದ ಹೊರೆ ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ಹಾಕಬಾರದೆಂದು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಈ ಯೋಜನೆಯ ಆಡಳಿತ ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಇರಬೇಕು ಎಂಬ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಎದ್ದಿದೆ. ನಾವು ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಇದು ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೇ ಸೇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ವಾದಮಾಡುವುದಾದರೆ, ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಲೋಪದೋಷಗಳು ಕೂಡ ಉಂಟಾಗಿ, ಈಗ ಹಿಂದೂಸ್ತಾನ ಮತ್ತು ಪಾಕಿಸ್ತಾನಗಳಿಗೆ ನೀರಿನ ಹಂಚಿಕೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಜಗಳ ಉಂಟಾಗಿದೆಯೋ ಹಾಗೆ ನಾಳೆಯದಿನ-ಅಂದರೆ ಮುಂದೆ-ಆಂಧ್ರರಿಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ಕನ್ನಡಿಗರಿಗೂ ಜಗಳ ಉಂಟಾಗದ ಹಾಗೆ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಆಂಧ್ರ, ಮೈಸೂರು ಮತ್ತು ಹೈದರಾಬಾದ್—ಈ ಮೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಗಳ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳನ್ನೂ ಒಳಗೊಂಡ ಒಂದು ಸಂಯುಕ್ತ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಏರ್ಪಟ್ಟು, ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಇದರ ಆಡಳಿತವನ್ನು ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸುವುದಾದರೆ, ಅದರಿಂದ ಈ ನೀರಿನ ಸರಬರಾಯಿ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಯೋಜನೆಯ ಮುಂದಿನ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಯಾವ ತೊಂದರೆಯೂ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಸುಗಮವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯಲು ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿ ನಾನು ಈ ಯೋಜನೆಯ

ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿವಾದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಸ್ಪದವಿಲ್ಲದ ರೀತಿ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Sir, in this connection we will have to think very seriously. The expenditure on the work is one thing. The work may take 5 years or 10 years or any further period whatever it may be. But the administration will have to go on for hundreds of years, and permanently. Whether in respect of any other administration and administrative control is a matter to be thought of very seriously. In the Seventh Schedule para 2, it is said :

> " In this paragraph expression 'land' includes immovable properties of every kind and any rights in or over such properties, etc."

The words used are 'any rights in or over such properties'. So, the land, the immovable property on the land will be in the land of Mysore, that apart, in respect of the bund and other portion of it, whether any other Government or even a Board could have control over this administration, is a matter for serious consideration.

(A VOICE : ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೊಟ್ಟುಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರಲ್ಲ.)

Having got the whole thing, what right we can have over that area for administration, is the question. My friend Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy who was most patriotic, was thinking of a Corporation and the apportionment of the rights among three States, etc. I do not know why he did not think of the right of Mysore to have administrative control. After all, what is the liability of the other government ? Their liability is to pay for the water that they receive, *i.e.*, on the receipt of water from this tank, in proportion to that, in proportion to the liabilities that they bear, they will have to receive water. There a liaison officer may be placed. Take for instance the system in respect of Krishnarajasagar Dam. We are having the administrative control over it. There is a certain amount of water to be allowed to Madras and there is an agreement in ragerd to that. Under that agreement Madras is entitled to a certain share of water. A liaison officer could be kept here as well to watch whether the terms of the agreement are adhered to.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What is the system prevailing in respect of the K. R. S. ?

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—The administrative control of the K.R.S. is in the hands of the Government of Mysore.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—Entirely.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Yes, entirely. So the only thing is, for the quantum of water they receive, to that extent they pay for it. So it would be the only means by which the agreement can be adhered to. Any agreement we may come to is with reference to the water we allow, and if no water is received, what would be the liabilty ? There can be no liability but at the same time the land is situated within the Mysore State and in the Right Bank we can grow any crop we like. They cannot prevent it. Otherwise, if they have control, so many problems will arise. As Sri L. Siddappa pointed out, so many problems such as rehabilitation problems, etc., will arise. While the risk is on us, they cannot have control, and if they have control, it may involve us in difficulties for a number of years to come, say to the end of the world. That is not correct.

My friend, Sri Imam was also suggesting whether any liability would be allotted to us for payment of money to them. It can only be book adjustment in due course. When a certain apportionment is made to us that we are to take certain liability, that will be in due course adjusted. This is a thing that has come to us on account of certain contingencies which have arisen on account of the Andhra State being formed. Therefore, it might have been considered as a Central project ; they will have to bear the entire cost of it. That is a different thing. I request the Government of Mysore to press on them the need that was suggested by Sri

(SRI A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.)

L. Siddappa and Sri Imam about these risks, attendant risks of the malaria problems, the rehabilitation problem and other problem. After all, under an agreement if they take certain liability, we are bound to supply that much of water and on receipt of water in the tank, that water can be given. After all, we may have to foot the cost and it will be at the end of the year the apportionment of the respective Governments may have to be paid. This is the position. Therefore, we are also trying to take certain risks. At first, paying, and maintaining the whole thing and at the end of the year sending the bill to them for all the costs on the terms of the agreement. After all, Sir, whether they manage or whether we manage, nobody can have any doubts on our administrative capacity. I have no objection for a Board being set up just to see that this agreement is adhered to. That is a different thing. But the administrative control should entirely and fully be in the hands of the Government of Mysore on the analogy of the Krishnarajasagara.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY (Srirangapatna).—That is only for impounding water.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—My friend who wanted to support Mysore should not raise his voice like this. Let us first claim the administrative claim. Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy has, of course, a right to say, because he wants to safeguard the interests of the Andhra State rather than of Mysore. But for Sri Puttaswamy to raise his voice in this way would not be correct, I submit. Anyway, Sri Puttaswamy may also oppose this and say that they should have control and not we ; or let him say we shall have diarchy or triarchy because hitherto there was only diarchy. My frineds want triarchy consisting of the representatives of Andhra, Mysore and Hyderabad. Three people to sit and administer that area and pass orders !! When there is a dispute, the representative of Andhra will say 'You allow all water' and the Hyderabad representative will say 'You allow only half water'. Could there be any administration like that ? There cannot be either diarchy or triarchy.

(There was interruption by Sri K. Puttaswamy).

I am not yielding Sir, you may take your chance and answer me. Anyway, I am strongly and definitely of the opinion that the Government of Mysore, if necessary, with the Opposition leaders, must go to Delhi and fight and get this right to Mysore to have the administrative control completely.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—You are capable of shouldering that responsibility.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Yes, I thank the Opposition Leader for giving that compliment to me.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy, in view of this discussion, I think you will not move the amendment. If that is so, you may have a chance to speak.

Sri MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.—I will move my amendment, Sir.

5 P.M.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—After I listened to Sri Bheemappa Naik, if that is the consensus of opinion of this House, then the whole Clause will have to be recast. Because this Clause envisages the position that this project is more the property of the Andhra State than the property of the Mysore State. The provisions of the Bill will make it clear. In the VII Schedule there is a Clause that all the liabilities on the appointed day would go to the Andhra State. Therefore, when the liability would go to the Andhra State, naturally it follows that it will be construed more or less as the property of the Andhra State. Therefore, we have to make up our mind clearly. If, as is defined in Section 2, if that definition has to be strictly construed, then the whole

project becomes the property of the Mysore State because the extent of 133 square miles of area submerged in water will become Mysore State property. The dam is Mysore State property. Nearly half the lower canal is in Mysore State; only the tail end of the canal will be in Andhra State.

Regarding sharing of liabilities and assets, "subject to agreement," they say; but the tenor of clause 62-A as well as provisions of the VII Schedule make it more the property of the Andhra State than the property of the Mysore State. I was referring to 12 (3) (*b*) of the VII Schedule.

> "The expenditure incured on the Tungabhadra Irrigation and Hydro-Electric Project up to the commencement of the appointed day shall be deemed to have been incurred in the territories of the State of Andhra."

Therefore, it was very difficult for us in the Cabinet to take a decision also on this subject. We considered the matter threadbare. It may be that the House may take the view: 'Why do you take such huge liability for the whole Project. Let Andhra Government take the liability and let rights correspondingly go to them'. Therefore, it is after all not a matter pertaining to party politics. We are one in safeguarding the interests of Mysore State. Of course according to law and equity; we are not going out of bounds so far as law and equity are concerned. If we have to claim the whole Tungabhadra Project as the property of Mysore State, let us do so and let us take the liability also. Then the question arises regarding Andhra State as to how much quantity of water has to be supplied to Andhra State both in the low level canal as well as in the high level canal. Low level canal is already finished; we have got 107 miles and the rest about 100 miles or so is in Andhra State. High level canal has not yet been taken up. Its length, the acres it should irrigate, are all matters for negotiations. If you read Clause 62-A (5), you will see that they want us to commit ourselves to the position of supplying water not only to Bellary District but to Anantapur, Cuddapah and Kurnool. If these three districts are to be supplied with water, then there is very little water for Bellary District; we cannot utilise our own property according to our interests. Therefore, if the House gives me direction that this Tungabhadra Project must be the property of Mysore State and correspondingly we have to bear the burden, then the whole Clause will have to be redrafted, of course, in consultation with the members of this House.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—One clarification. It is stated in the VII Schedule that the liability incurred on the Tungabhadra Project will be assigned to Andhra State. But again that liability will have to be apportioned between Andhra and Mysore. So we will not escape that liability. Between Madras and Andhra they fixed the liability incurred on Tungabhadra and assigned it to Andhra. Here there is a fresh agreement between Mysore and Andhra and they will fix the liability on us and in any case we cannot escape the liability.

I entirely agree with the remarks made by the Hon'ble the Chief Minister. I suggest that sub-clause 5 may be deleted. Otherwise....

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Not only sub-clause 5; if the fundamental proposition is conceded that the Tungabhadra Project should be Mysore State property according to the definition, then the whole clause will have to be redrafted.

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—Have you any idea under what circumstances this clause has been drafted? It is not 62 or 63. It seems to be a fresh clause.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Yes, Sir. The Government of India consulted the views of the Government of Madras and the Government of Mysore and also of what is called the Andhra section of the Ministry of Madras Government. We took up the stand that this project must be the property of Mysore State. The position is the

(SRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA.)

Andhra State is not agreeable to such a course. They feel that the project must be considered more as their property and Mysore State must merely utilize the water and pay according to an agreement. Even if it becomes the property of Mysore State, Andhra State will become merely recipients of the waters to the extent of the agreement. Whether that position should be conceded or the position I suggested should be agreed upon—it is for you to take a decision. But the Government of India probably are more inclined towards the representation made by the Madras Government and they have worded the clause accordingly. Here, we are more or less like lessees or tenants and not owners of property as such.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—62 (a) resolves all doubts and difficulties. The Seventh Schedule defines " land " as including everything such as water stored in the reservoir, hydro-electric works under the Tungabhadra Project, the head works, etc., and all that would come under the definition of land, the land that would pass on to Mysore as soon as the Bill becomes law, then the territory on which it stands would become Mysore State's. Therefore, the question of ownership of the project, I think, is not open to serious doubt. It is not merely legal ownership of it ....

Sri L. SIDDAPPA.—Please see clause (i) of the Seventh Schedule which reads " Subject to the other provisions of this Schedule, all land and all stores ....

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—That is why I was suggesting that the other provisions of the Seventh Schedule, which require careful examination, would assist us to determine what we should do. 62 (a) which was not in the original Bill has been superadded and it has presented serious difficulties. In fact, it is a matter on which any further time we spend would certainly be helpful to the Government. Since it is already time, unless the House sits longer, we may hold over consideration of this clause for tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That would be more desirable and profitable.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—I agree, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—So far as the remaining clauses are concerned I will put them to the vote of the House. The question is :

> " That clauses 63 and 64 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Schedule 1 to 6. The question is :

> " That the Schedules 1 to 6, both inclusive, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The remaining schedules and some of the clauses which are reserved will be taken up tomorrow.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—We feel like having holiday on Saturday ; we are having two holidays and if one day which is intervening is also made a holiday, it would give the Members some respite to go to their places and come. We used to sit for 3 to 4 hours on Saturday and that can be made up on Monday or any other day.

DISCUSSION ON QUESTIONS Nos. 212 AND 213.

Administration of the Bangalore Race Club.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now discussion on matters of public importance arising out of answers to questions to raise discussion in respect of questions Nos. 212 and 213, regarding the administration of the Race Club by Sri S. Srinivasa Iyengar.